श्रीमती प्रतिभा देवीसिंह पाटील : नहीं, मैं उम्र नहीं पूछ रही हूं । ... **(व्यवधान)**

श्री पर्वतनेनि उपेन्द्र : और वह भी किती बेचेलर से । ... **(व्यवधान)**

श्रीमती प्रतिभा देवीसिंह पाटील : मैं क्या कहना चाहती हूं, आप सुनने की कोशिश कीजिए । मैं यह कह रही हूं कि अपनी पचास या पचपन साल की उम्र में अपने जीवन में लाने की किसी एक महिला के बारे में वह राय नहीं बना सके, तो कोई डिप्टी चेयरमैन जो दो साल के लिए थी, उसके लिए वह क्या कह सकते हैं ।

तो मैं आपकी कठिनाई जरूर समझती हूं और बगैर राय बनाने के भी जो आपने अच्छे शब्द कहे, इसके लिए मैं आपकी बहुत आभारी हूं ।

मैं सभी सदन की भी बहुत आभारी हूं और चेयरमैन साहब आपकी तो बहुत-बहुत आभारी हूं ।

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION
Bofors gun deal

MR. CHAIRMAN: Short Duration Discussion. Shri Gurupadaswamy.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA (Andhra Pradesh): I am on a point of order.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, point of order. We have also given you certain notices for discussion on the most baseless, malicious and politically motivated allegations made by Shri V. P. Singh against Mr. Gandhi, our Prime Minister. What has happened to our notices?

MR. CHAIRMAN: This was decided in the meeting of the leaders of the Opposition and your party leaders also.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: What will happen to our notices?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You will discuss everything...

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM (Tamil Nadu): You ask your leader as to what has happened in the meeting....(*Interruptions*).. This is the consensus.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri Jagesh Desai) in the Chair.]

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Karnataka): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, in the history of Parliament, we have discussed in the past, many scandals, many sordid events. We have debated the Mundhra scandal, we have debated the *jeep scandal and, like that, we have been* discussing many sordid developments in our body politic. But never and never had we a scandal like Bofors, with gigantic, Himalayan, ramifications.

When this debate began in April last year, I never thought that the Bofors gun deal would give rise to controversies and such vital and irreconcilable differences between the ruling party and the Opposition.

This scandal has shaken in my view the very moral foundation of our political system. I am not looking at this obviously from a narrow angle. I am not here to score points against the Government and the ruling party. I am raising this issue from a broader angle whether our system, the political system can effectively deal with such scandals effectively and in conformity with domestic values and traditions we cherish.

Various things have been debated in the past. The report of the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Bofors gun deal has also been debated. It is not necessary for me to go over once again the whole ground which has been covered. The Government, the various Ministers and particularly the Prime Minister have taken varying positions, irreconcilable, utterly contradictory positions so far as the Bofors gun deal is concerned. One thing stands out Sir, you will agree with me, that at no time in these 40 years of our parliamentary life have we seen the

Government wilting so much under the attack as on today. No other scandal, no other issue shook the Government as the Bofors gun deal. This has got to be admitted.

When the Swedish radio broadcast this issue and said that kickbacks were involved in the Bofors gun deal, the statement we got from the Government side was that the report was mischievous, baseless and false. There was statement after statement saying that no middlemen were involved, no commission was paid. That was the basic stand of the Government. We questioned that stand. Even now that is the central issue, focal issue, whether there were middlemen involved in the gun deal and, if so, whether commission has been paid to them, contrary to the decision of the Government. The Government took several positions. They said there were no middlemen, no commissions. Later they said only winding up charges have been paid to certain agents. Then they said no Indian is involved; then they said no non-resident Indian is involved; then they said no politician is involved. And to cap it all, the Prime Minister had to say that he is not involved and his family is not involved. Now he has come out with another statement that he has no account in the Swiss Bank. The basic question is whether commission was paid, whether middlemen were there, whether kickback was involved, whether bribery was paid to influence decision in favour of Bofors. Other issues are peripheral issues. A great deal was made out on termination charges given to these companies-Svenska, A.E. Services, Moresco and others. I have got records to show that no termination charges were paid, but only commissions were paid. Sir, A.E. Services were paid commission. I have got record here. It says: Commissions due to you 50. 463.96 SEK. The word used is commission, not termination charges. I have similar commissions referred to here. We have payments made to Svenska Incorporated. Invoice No. and date is given. On 8-12-1986. .

THE MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER): May I just ask him a clarification? Is it other than what has already appeared in *The Hindu* and other papers or is it something new?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Most of them are from *The Hindu.*

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: *They have been confirmed by the PM.*

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Invoice No. 1014836 dated 8-12-1986—4.729.190 SEK was paid to Svenska incorporated. Again to Svenska Invoice No. 1013501 and 1013503, dated 9-1-1986 and 10-1-1986. For both, 422,909.40 SEK has been paid. On 19-2-1987 invoice No. 1012008—134,225.34 SEK has been paid. There are other payments also on 25-2-1987, 26-2-1987 and again 26-2-1987, 4-3-1987, 4.3.1987. Total SEK 469,864.66 has been paid. All commissions were due to material supply to the Secretary to the Government of India. They relate to the supply. They are not charges paid for terminating the contract. Then, on 16-9-1987 also there has been a payment of SEK 68695.76 and to the AE Services. Sir, I have got documents here referring to one Marshi, and reference Tulip, another Lefont, *Lotus, another reference Mont Blanc, and* reference 35. "The commission due to you for deliveries during the fourth quarter 1986 SEK 92,697.28 has been paid on 18-12-1986." So there have been several payments made to these accounts. There have also been payments to Moresco. I have got the entire payment made to Moresco and Pitco accounts. All these show that commissions have been paid. They are not termination charges or winding up charges. The Prime Minister has given an interview to the "Sunday" magazine. He has admitted "there might be middlemen". He says "perhaps it was paid for some genuine work that was done for Bofors." He goes on to say "we cannot question it if there is genuine work done on behalf of Bofors." It is a new element. What is new about it? He never said before that work was done on behalf of the Bofors by middlemen for which payment has been made. That was not the stand on the Government earlier, and the Joint Parliamentary Committee took the same

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

stand that there were no middlemen. Here is a confession made by the Prime Minister that there might be middlemen.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Might be.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: "Might be" is my word and not his word. He was very positive. I am giving the benefit of doubt. "If it was paid for some genuine work gathering information against the French weapon." Thus he goes on. He explains "there is an industrial espionage" He says "I am saying the whole amount could have been paid for genuine work. Then, we cannot question it." Here is the Prime Minister of this great country who has taken a brief on behalf of Bofors. Eeven Bofors did not take this stand before the Joint Parliamentary Committee. For the first time, we have been told by the Prime Minister that for the genuine work done by the middlemen, 64 crores of rupees has been paid and he does not remember even Rs. 64 crores also. When he was asked by the journalists, he said, yes, Rs. 64 crores might have been paid for genuine work done by the middlemen. I have given to the House the various payments made by Bofors to their agents and nowhere I find the work "winding up charges". In all the payments made to various agencies, the word "commission" has been mentioned in respect of supplies made on behalf of Bofors to India in the gun deal. Sir, what is the inference then? Obviously, the previous stand of the Government and the Prime Minister was untenable and the Government has admitted that payment made to middlemen was compensation for the genuine work done by middlemen on their behalf, on behalf of Bofors. If that is so, where do we stand? Either the Prime Minister is misleading the Parliament and the people of India or he is trying to cover up a shady deal by resorting to various subterfuges and various statements. Otherwise, we cannot make out the stand of the Prime Minister. To be very frank, the Prime Minister has avoided the two Houses of Parliament. Whenever we took up Bofors gun deal for discussion, in a way, ther is a suspicion cast in my mind, why is he avoiding debate? He is putting up spokesman after spokesman to speak on his behalf, on behalf of the Government of India. It is not objectionable. But why does he not come and defend himself on the floor of the House? This scandal has shaken up his credibility, I may say, destroyed his credibility.

Nobody believes him. Why not he be here? Even now I request him that he must be here.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: He has made the position absolutely clear in the House itself when he said that "I have nothing to do and neither any member of my family has anything to do." This has been made clear. Now, what more do you want? You are saying that he should defend himself. Why should he defend himself after saying this?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, Mr. P. Shiv Shanker is a very intelligent man, very honourable man.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: So are you.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: But he will agree with me when I say that it is possible to have an account. My money can be kept by somebody else in his name. It is not necessary for me to keep my money in my own name and in my own account. It is possible. *(Interruptions)*.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Please listen There are about twenty-five Members who want to speak on this. Even if they take about 10 minutes each, it will require more than four hours and then the Minister will have to reply. We have to do this in such a manner that within four or five hours we can finish this business. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: No. It is a lengthy discussion.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): So, shall we skip the lunch hour today?

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: We want the lunch-hour.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY (Uttar Pradesh): We need lunch.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): I am leaving it to your option. Can we skip the lunch-hour?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Madhya Pradesh): The speech can be resumed after the lunch-brake.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): The House now stands adjourned for lunch and will meet again at 2.30. p.m.

The House then adjourned for lunch at thirty-one minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled, after lunch, at thirty-one minutes past two of the clock, **The Vice-Chairman [Shri Jagesh Desai)** in the chair]

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Mr. Vice Chairman, in the pre-lunch hour I was saying that the payments made to various agencies like Svenska, Moresco and AE Services were not winding up charges, they were commissions paid to middlemen and these commissions were paid violating the Government of India decision. These commissions were made all along, the denials of the Government of India are not strictly to be believed and these firms were bluff firms or bluff companies or front companies or front organisations which took money from Bofors to be transferred to some other unknown individuals. This is my charge. The Government took the position, as you are aware that the Public Prosecutor in Sweden Mr. Lars Ringberg did not continue his investigation and closed it and the interference drawn from that was he had no case against Bofors. Later on, the Swedish Government itself and the Swedish Parliament took up this issue and the Director of Public Grievances of Swedish Parliament asked the Appellate Public Prosecutor to prosecute two or four, I am not very sure, Directors of Bofors for indulging in fabrication, falsehood, cheating and misleading their Parliament and misleading their people. It has come out in the Swedish Press that Bofors were supplying arms and ammunition illegally, clandestinely, to some of the Middle-East countries and Taiwan. All these things have been discovered after the Bofors deal with India. Therefore, the stand of the Government of India that they did what all they could in approaching the Government of Sweden, the Public Prosecutor there, to help them in finding out the truth behind this payment cannot be believed. The Government of India even today must make a reference, must make a request, to the Swedish Government and the Appellate Public Prosecutor there to carry on the investigation and to unearth the secret, to unearth the truth, behind this deal.

Sir, the Joint Parliamentary Committee did not take into consideration the disclosures made by the papers, "The Hindu" and the "Indian Express" later on. Parliament is entitled to know from this Committee why this was not taken into consideration at all. Why was it not done? They could have taken more time; they could have found out the veracity of the publications in the "Hindu" which appeared at that time; but they did not do that. All the statements made by the Government of India in this respect add to the confusion only. Sir, the Prime Minister has told the journalists who interviewed him on behalf of the "Sunday" magazine—I quote—

> "To the best of my knowledge, money has not been used to influence the decision-making process."

He has said, "to the best of my knowledge". Perhaps he had to say so. But I would like to know from the Prime Minister on what basis he could make that statement. It is known that payment has been made, Rs. 64 crores have been paid,

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

by Bofors for this deal and it is also known that three front organisations have been the recipients, that is, A.E. Services, Moresco and Svenska. But it is not known who are behind these front organisations. That is the only thing that has got to be found out. But the Government has not made any effort to find out the truth from the Government of Sweden. They have not approached the Government of Sweden and they have not approached the Government of Switzerland. At one point of time, the Government of Switzerland was prepared to give the information and Shri Narayan Datt Tiwari, I think, in July last year, said that they would be making efforts.

SHRI P SHIV SHANKER: Is it so?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Yes, I will quote.

Shri Narayan Datt Tiwari, on 30th July, 1987, said like this:

> "Even without entering into a bilateral treaty with the Government of Switzerland... We try to find out the truth." To that extent he has gone. I think, a memorandum of understanding has also been drafted...

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENCE PRODUCTION AND SUPPLIES IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI): You quoted just now that Mr. Narayan Dutt Tiwari has said that the Government of Switzerland is prepared. But you say that he will try to find out.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Is it from Mr. Noorani's article?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: I am quoting from the Indian Express dated November, 15th. It is from an article by Mr. Noorani. I am quoting from there.

Anyway, the point, Sir, is that it has been said that the Government of India is making an effort to find out the truth. And I am told that a memorandum of understanding has also been drafted for that purpose. Till today I do not know what has happened to that, whether the Government is making efforts to find out all the account numbers and the people who are behind those accounts in the Swiss bank.

Sir, the whole thing boils down to this: The payment made to middlemen was for the purpose of influencing the decision in favour of Bofors. And it is bribery to get the order of the Government of India in its favour. Therefore, nothing is settled in the case of Bofors. Mr. K. C. Pant in the last session said that everything is over, curtain is drawn on Bofors. Nothing is drawn. It will go on till the truth is found out.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Till the elections.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Till you are defeated.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: He is an honourable man. He is also a politician. (*Interruptions*) Sir I would demand a fresh probe into the whole thing—a fresh probe by a Joint Parliamentary Committee with comprehensive terms of difference.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI M. M. JACOB): Mr. Gurupadaswamy, you yourself wanted a parliamentary committee, in the first instance. But when the committee was constituted you backed out. Again parliamentary committee?

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH (West Bengal): This time you be the Chairman, we will join.

SHRI M S. GURUPADASWAMY: You remember, I was the first who started a debate on Bofors. At that time I said that there should be a Joint Parliamentary Committee and I thought that committee would have comprehensive terms of reference. But it was truncated:

the inquiry was truncated. The report was also truncated. Therefore, I would like the Government to refer this issue once again to a Joint Parliamentary Committee with comprehensive terms of reference, the Chairman of that committee should be a member of the Opposition. Otherwise I go along with my friend, Mr. Arun Singh, who made a speech last time, demanding that Bofors should be black-listed. What prevents you from black-listing? The Prime Minister has said that if black-listed it will affect the security of the country. May I tell you, Sir, that if Bofors has committed such fraud and has indulged in falsification of records, nothing short of black-listing that company needs to be done. If this is done, then I am sure that in future any company or any organisation which enters into a contract with the Government of India will be careful and there will be no repetition of such scandals. Therefore, I demand that BOFORS should be blacklisted. I further demand that this matter should be referred for inquiry by a Joint Parliamentary Committee in which an opposition member should be the Chairman and the terms of reference for this purpose should be very comprehensive.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE (Maharashtra): Sir, the opposition has been anxious to discuss this issue once again. We have also been keen to discuss it for the simple reason that we think we have reached a stage when we should tell them that enough is enough and that we are not willing to put up with what we consider a sheer sanctimonious humbug and that let the issue be resolved once, for all.

Sir, this is the umpteenth time we are debating this issue. I do not know how many dozens of times we have debated this very issue and this very demand which my dear friend, Mr. Gurupadaswamy, has made about having another committee, a large committee; this and that. For what? Where is it going to lead us? Where we have come? What has this House been reduced to? We are not worried about terrorism in Punjab. We are not worried about the very dismal fiscal situation in the country. We are not worried about the political ideologies and perceptions, so essential to build up our democracy. We are not worried about unemployment. We are not worried about poverty alleviation. But my friends on my right hand must cling on every time in Parliament session—winter session, monsoon session or budget session—to this issue. In the first few days of every session, they must stick on to this straw of BOFORS scandal before they think totally and conclusively and finally. How long will it go on like this? The new generation is looking up to us and it is rightly impatient. It wants better economic amenities and securities. They are no longer interested in this kind of debate going on in season and out of season — and mostly out of season — in this House. They are no longer interested in tall talks of anybody which is a damp squib, which the BOFORS scandal is and has proved to be every time.

Sir, I have studied the documents. I have studied the documents with my background in the accountancy profession and in the background of long years which I have spent in the practice of taxation. What conclusions I have come to I shall be coming to it later. But I understand that the very debate proceeds upon an assumption that a charge has been levelled by Mr. V. P. Singh of bribery and corruption relating to BOFORS deal. The Times of India dated 9th November reported a charge by Mr. V. P. Singh. Depending on these three documents his charge was that Shri Rajiv Gandhi has deposited an equivalent of 8 and odd crores of rupees received in BOFORS deal. Sir, I don't have the paper here. But this is the gist. I believe that in the other House, the Speaker said to Mr. V. P. Singh: "Do you reiterate this charge?" And there was no reaffirmation of this charge by Mr. V. P. Singh in the other House. If that be the story and what I am stating here is correct, then what are we debating: Mr. Gurupadaswamy? (*Interruptions*). You yourself said, Mr. Gurupadaswamy, I have listened to your speech.

[Shri N. K. P. Salve]

SHRI ANAND SHARMA (Himachal Pradesh): I have something to say and you can give your decision on it. (*Interruptions*) I am on a point of order. Sir. Sir, the time of this august House is very precious. In this House, Members are expected to discuss matters of national importance...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): But the Chairman...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, please listen to me fully. After what Mr. Salve has said, what are we discussing today? This entire discussion is based on contradictory statements made by Mr. Vishwanath Pratap Singh on 5th and 7th of November, and he himself has denied. He has refused to own those statements in the other House. Why are we wasting the time? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: Sir, have you allowed him?

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I am exercising my right... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI DEBA PRASAD RAY (West Bengal): Sir, who are they to shout at him?

(*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DASAI): Please be seated. I am on my legs. Yes, Mr. Salve.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Sir, the very debate has been brought before the House... (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): The Chairman has allowed this discussion...

SHRI DEBA PRASAD RAY: He has made a point of order. Who are they to shout at him? (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): No, no. I have not allowed. Nothing will go on record.

SHRI DEBA PRASAD RAY:**

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Nothing will go on record. Yes, Mr. Salve.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Sir, Mr. V. P. Singh.

SHRI DARBARA SINGH (Punjab): He kept mum and he could not reply to those charges.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Sir, I submit for your consideration... (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Our Chairman has allowed as Short Duration Discussion on this, and the matter will go on.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Even otherwise, Sir, as I submitted, it was a damp squib. The whole debate has reduced itself to a damp squib because, Sir, I want to submit; what was the basis of the entire debate, why did we have to suspend all the rules and bring in this Short Duration Discussion. It is because various averments have been made by Mr. V. P. Singh outside and the Press has been carrying that. And the gravamen of his charge is that Mr. Rajiv Gandhi has taken bribe in respect of Bofors deal. In fact, Mr. Gurupadaswamy very fairly in the initial stages of his speech said—I quote him—that the basic issue is whether kickbacks are involved, whether bribery was involved in the Bofors deal. You have yourself said that. It is not your own charge, Mr. Gurupadaswamy. I submit with respect to you. It is a charge you are reiterating on the basis of somebody else, your leader who is coming out as a paragon of virtue after having gone from our Party, a messiah of incorruptibility and honesty. When asked upon by the Speaker to say, "Are you reiterating this charge?", he observed silence. If that be the situation, what are we discussing and what are we discussing for? The minimum that I submit, Sir, is that to get out of it at this stage is the height of cowardice at which I will not be surprised. Sir, I want to submit...

**Not recorded.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: He is taking everybody for a ride.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Yes, you can fool somebody for all the time, all the people for some time, but not all the people for all the time... (*Interruption*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Mr. Anand Sharma, you will get a chance. You are the second speaker from this side.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: He must tell us what he did in New York.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): No cross-talk, please.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Sir, I was submitting to you. I was trying to examine the validity of this kind of argument being flaunted against us that these documents lead us to an infallible inference that there has been bribery, there have been kickbacks, there has been dishonesty, and that there has been corruption. Sir, I have the privilege of belonging to the same profession to which you belong. For long many years, I have been in the profession of Accountancy, and for large many years I have been in the practice of taxation. Therefore, Sir....

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: You know better how to change the account head.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Therefore, Sir, as an expert, I do claim to be having some expertise for evaluation of documents of this type. Hundreds and thousands of invoices I have examined in the course of my auditing profession and millions of documents I have had to examine and work upon and argue before the court to establish this kind of an allegation that x is involved or y is involved, or that x has defrauded the revenue or y has defrauded the revenue, and that is why for large years of my life, best years of my life, this was part of my profession. And I want to submit as an expert, at the very outset, that for the reasons which I will enumerate now hereafter, a little later, I submit that unless one is dispossed of his rational faculties he would never accept that these documents are worth more than the paper on which photostat copies have been obtained to prove a charge of bribery or a kickback. They are not even worth the value of the paper on which the photostat copies have been taken. Sir, I can understand that in any democratic polity there is going to be, we have given to ourselves party politics, there is bound to be some sort of political gimmickery, there is some sort of political skulduggery which must go on to wheel the people on your side, but that far and no further. Sir, should it be taken to a point where you are likely to destroy the very credibility of your democratic polity, where you are likely to destroy the very foundation of the democratic institutions, important democratic institutions, where you are likely to affect adversely the institution of Parliamentary democracy Sir, in the garb of strengthening democracy, or cleansink or purging it from corruption, please do not take out the funeral of democracy every day. That is what is happening. What has happened, Sir? Here he has levelled charges against us here. I did not realise that his glass-house was much bigger than ours. There is a charge levelled against Mr. V. P. Singh of Himalayan dishonesty. He is alleged to have more than Rs. 750 crores slashed in a Swiss bank account and proof of that is available with Mr. Sathe. It is named in the Universe Mr. Visva. Will he be able to adduce one single evidence to prove that Mr. Sathe is wrong and he is right? What happens to him now? The chickens have come home to roost. Not a word is said about this excepting that he has said, you prove it. How do you disprove it, is the question. Sir, if I were to allege that so far as these documents are concerned, assuming while not conceding, they are true, they are genuine, and that they are front companies for Mr. Gurupadaswamy or for Mr. Subramanian or for anybody, or for anybody here, is there any method by which they will be able to disprove anybody's name, however innocent they may be, however unrelated they may be, and you prove something which you know it cannot be proved? Is this the basis. Can this be the foundation for this kind of a debate, if it is to be a serious debate? Is it not

[Shri N. K. P. Salve]

under-mining? Is it not under-mining the very institution of the Prime Ministership that this kind of charges are being levelled? Well if one were to say that these documents create some doubt, well they certainly created doubt when we discussed 20 months ago or a year ago, soon after the Committee's report was out. Well at that time itself one could have said it takes us to some doubt, but will doubt take the place of proof and if you are levelling the charge of bribery and corruption, is the proof irrelevant, or is it enough that for purposes of aggrandizement of political interest you will get up and say today the Prime Minister has taken, tomorrow Shiv Shanker has taken and then Mr. Panigrahi has taken, such a line may in the Defence Ministry. How will they disprove, any one of them? Knowing this, again times without number, in season and out of season as I said earlier, this is sought to be raised. Sir, I really wish that Mr. V. P. Singh honestly disproves to the hilt what Mr. Sathe has said. Otherwise, he is no less innocent than what anyone else may be, whose name is being dragged very unfairly and unjustly. I am speaking for myself, this kind of an allegation does no good and if someone came and talked to me, people did come and they did talk to me about massive tax evasion and they talked of massive moneys being stashed in Swiss banks by some opposition parties. I consider this plenty of nonsense for one reason that this kind of an allegation is detrimental to the basic interest of Parliamentary democracy. If you want to nurse an institution, please do not take these matters so lightly, be serious about it or keep your hand on your heart and say, this leads us to an inference that an Indian is involved, that a non-resident Indian is involved, that you know who it is, whose it is a front company, or whose front company it could be. It could be anybody's front company. There are so many people living in India and in the world. How can we be sure that it is not the front company of somebody from China or somebody from Timbuctoo. All sorts of wild allegations are sought to be made. In view of your difficulty that we want to finish it today, I will not take too long. But let us try to evaluate the documents and statements

3 P.M from which Mr. V. P. Singh is backing out in the other House. Now, first and foremost, I want to submit for your consideration, Mr. Gurupadaswamy, are these documents not the very same which appeared earlier in The Hindu?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Yes, but they were not investigated.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: They have appeared in *The Hindu* much earlier, on 23rd of June, 1986.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: But they have not been investigated into

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Therefore, this evidence by itself dose not take their case any farther than what the documents of Hindu had taken. It is a proposition I am formulating.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: It has strengthened the case.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: If somebody else issues the same documents, do they become more authentic? Do they become more veracious? Do they become more reliable? Do they become more dependable? It does not take their case any farther than what the case did take when these documents were published in *The Hindu*. (*Interruptions*). Sir, I do not want to reply to every query. All that I want to submit is there is nothing new in these documents. It is the old document Only they are wanting to change the labels. If you are coming to this House with an allegation, and as you yourself said that the basic question is of bribery, of kickbacks, how can you say—if you could not at that juncture ever say—that someone has taken the kickback, or someone has indulged in bribery or corruption and who that person, the recipient of that bribery and corruption is? How are you in a better position to say the same very thing today? By raising the

same and same question again, by multiplying untruths and allegations, do you think you are establishing the veracity, you are establishing the truth or the dependability of the documents on the basis of which you are levelling such a serious criminal charge on somebody, on the Prime Minister of this country? It is very unfair, very unjust.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY (Andhra Pradsh): It will come out.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Yes, that is why, your great leader, newly-found leader—I do not know who your leader is NTR or VPS—your newly—found leader, your newly-found messiah, your political messiah, our deserter initially said that these documents conclusively, positively, unequivocally prove that there is.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: It is your party that supplies messiahs.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: I have respect for your party; but they are not willing to work with you. They have some ideology. Sir, I may not agree; but this party has some ideology and philosophy.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: We are one with you against corruption. But don't try to...

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: I am very happy that a Member of NTR's party says that he wants to fight corruption. I think charity begins at home. Let him start with that good work in his own State.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: But you could not prove anything; you are hiding what has been published in *The Hindu*. Even till this day you have not been bold enough to have a Parliamentary group to go into these charges

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: I submit for your consideration; I hope this irrelevance will not be counted in my time Sir. I was submitting, initial allegation was—I read it myself: I do not have got the cutting straightaway, but nobody will deny here, that conclusive proof has come, as if some new document, some new sensatitonal document has come out of the electronic memory which he used to carry—the latest messiah, the political messiah—and from that, he has been able to find some material which clinches the issue once for all, which decides the issue, that bribery has been taken in the Bofors deal, and the recipient of that bribery is our revered leader, Shri Rajiv Gandhi. Later on, when the senior members of the Cabinet said: 'Don't make these wild, reckless, irresponsible charges without any circumspection, and if you have some proof come out with it', quietly he tilted, quietly he backed out and slid from the earlier position and now says that these documents prove that commission has been paid, though earlier, we said that what had been paid was winding up charge. I had the privilege, on behalf of my party, to participate in one of the Bofors debates. When Mr. Arun Singh spoke, I was the second speaker from our party. Mr. Arun Singh, put a query to me as to what is this winding up charge I said that I had never heard anything by way of a winding up charge, that the nomenclature was unknown to me. I said that the cruciat question was the one raised by Mr. Gurupadaswamy whether, under the grab of this winding up charge, any bribery or corruption had taken place. What is the magic in these words winding up charges? It is only those people in the Bofors who are using these words. You may call it winding up charge. You may call it solatium for termination of contract or you may call it by any other name. What does it matter? The crucial question is whether you have documents which prove any bribery or corruption, which prove is any manner whatsoever that someone ..(*Interruptions*). The crucial question is whether any of these documents with the wildest of imagination applied to them, on whatever basis you are falling back upon, prove that there has been bribery. You have referred to certain non co-operation with the prosecutor in Sweden etc. Assuming that it is correct, does it prove that there has been bribery corruption and that the decision of the Government has been influenced? It has been accepted even by the Op-

[Shri B. Satyanarayan Reddy]

position that this has been the best buy. We could not have purchased anything better for this kind of money. To those who are arguing that we should resile from the contract because commission has been paid by Bofors, I would submit that they are suggesting to cut our own nose to spite ourselves. At that price, they will be too happy today not to give us their gun. We will have to go once again for some other gun. What happens? The supplier of some other gun will also pay commission somewhere. Then, you resile from that contract also with the result that perennially you starve yourself of the vital equipment necessary for India's defence and security.

Sir, my submission is that if the documents are really strong enough, if they are adequate enough, to lead anybody with a judicial mind to come to the conclusion that there has been some kind of hanky-panky, I would have understood this kind of thing being suggested, not even being implemented. But I submit that these documents are not even worth the paper on which they have been written. On the basis of such documents, you are wanting us to take upon ourselves the onerous, more cumbersome and more dufficult situation of cancelling the contract when it has been admitted by everyone that the price we paid was fairer than the best. This is the cheapest buy and this is the best buy. Why do we deny that to India?

Assuming for a moment that someone has taken commission, assuming for a moment that there is an element of dishonesty, should the country be divested of its right to acquire weapons, crucial weapons, needed for India's defence? This is the cheapest and the best buy. Under no circumstances, should this ever be accepted. We opposed it last time when Mr. Arun Singh suggested that Bofors should be asked to pay back the money, or, we should blacklist them and terminate the contract. If you terminate the contract, you do not penalise Bofors. You do not penalise those who have taken commission. You are only going to penalise your country, your own nation, and you are going to impoverish your own defence which should not be done under any circumstances.

Sir, politics should take you quite to some extent in wanting to distort things. But let us not take it to a point where the country's vital defence interests are involved. Nobody has seen the original document. Even Mr. V. P. Singh is not willing to say. He says that this is a photostat copy of the original. This is a document, the authenticity of which, the veracity of which, is not established by anyone. This is a secondary document Primary document none has seen. None is willing to testify that this is a true copy of the original. What is its worth then? Forget about proving it in a court of law. Forget about technical rules of evidence. Can this be accepted even by a person possessed of commonsense? When nobody has seen the original, when nobody is willing to say that he has seen the original, on the basis of such a photostat copy, which is wholly unverified, which is wholly unauthenticated, you are charging someone with corruption? Sir, what has happened to our newspapers? I do not understand. They are giving broad headlines every day. I wish some newspapers sat critically and seen whether these documents are any more than scraps of paper. If they find something, let them give publicity. I do concede. It is the duty of every newspaper to take dissent to the corridors of power. But it is one thing to take dissent to the corridors of power and it is another thing to indulge in extremely unworthy gimmickry to write things which are only sensational but as a result of which, perhaps, there is better sale of the newspaper. Sir, I am a friend of the newspapers and journalists. I stand for total freedom of the press. I have always said it and I stand by it. Therefore, I am only laving this doubt because I feel that the opposition on its own would never have taken up this issue had the newspapers been not giving banner headlines to all this. What has this Parliament come to? We come here to debate issues on the basis of what is reported in the papers. it is not that they report somthing for the issues which we raise. They raise issues for us and we merrily take them

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह (बिहार) : क्या आप अखबार को गैर जिम्मेदार समझते हैं . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: I maintain that it is for the dignity of this House, it is for the opposition parties, it is for us to raise issues of national importance and so also in the public life we raise important issues, but something has appeared in the newspapers somewhere and we take it as our cause. That is a very unfortunate situation, that will not add to the dignity of this House or this Chamber.

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : अखबार तो जम्हूरियत के रक्षक हैं ।

श्री एन०के०पी० साल्वे : मैं तो खुद इस बात को मानता हूं ।

Sir, there are three invoices. Now, see the merits of these three invoces, see the internal conflict which comes. There are 3 invoices and the first invoice is of 8.12 1986. Sir, it relates to Bofors but it does not relate of 155mm guns, it relates to some transaction for modification kits which had been purchased by Government of India for L70 guns. I am making this specific allegation here, Mr. Gurupadaswamy, that the first document does not relate to guns which have been purchased. It is Bofors but does not relate to the guns. What is the credibility of such a document, a document which does not relate to the commission in respect of which you are alleging? You are alleging kickbacks and bribery, but the document does not relate to the very transaction in respect of which you are saying that we have received these monies. Should there be no sense of responsibility, should we not make such allegations with circumspection and understanding? I maintain that this relates to Bofors but it does not relate to 155 mm guns, it relates to the kits which we have purchased for modification purpose for the L70 guns.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Did you buy something else from Bofors?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): May be of Bofors but for something else.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Yes. So, this is the story of the first document on the basis of which we are being damned, our party is being damned, our leader is being damned. Before nation it is sought to be projected that we are a bunch of corrupt fellows without knowing that this document does not relate to the transaction for which you are calling us corrupt. What have we come to? However, wild an allegation may be, but should it be so wild that it has nothing to do with the transaction for which we are being alleged to have taken bribes? Sir, I distinctly remember that Shri V. P. Singh has made another allegation that the name 'Lotus' appears and the Lotus means Rajiv. The documents are in respect of Svenska and, therefore, that Lotus and Rajiv business was given a back seat and what was said was that these are the front companies. *He was the Finance Minister who cleared it.* How are they not his front companies? A part of this could as well be 7750 which Mr. Sathe is referring to, not 1. It is easy to say, any company is a front company, but is it a bazaar gossip we are going to discuss here, is it on the bazaar gossip that we are going to suspend the rules for the whole day and discuss some matter of corruption and bribery, not knowing for a moment, realising that in these documents the inferences you yourself have drawn are all jumbled and confused? You did not know what you are talking about and when your attention was drawn and some light was thrown, then you decided to recede back and slide back. What about a very glaring dishonesty on the entire approach? An allegation was made that in these three invoices, the correct value of the commission paid works out to 3,20,76,709 Swedish Kroner. A cursory look at the document will show that this is the amount on which 6 per cent commission is paid.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Oh, it is 6 per cent of this!

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Yes. And the commission works out to a figure of 5,48,207,58. You are talking to the nation you are talking to the people who trust you, who believe you. At least be honest in the figures. At least take care to make a proper calculation. Take care to ensure

[Shri N. K. P. Salve]

that you do not commit errors in these figures. And to what purpose? Either it is gross dereliction and criminal neglect on the part of Mr. V. P. Singh for which he wants to lie prostrate before the nation and appologise to them, or if it is not, then it is a type of dishonesty which will only perhaps suit a person who is in the habit of changing parties to parties to aggrandise his political ends. It is a disgrace of the worst type. Even in respect of figures which are so palpable and clear, you are not willing to be honest about the whole situation! In these last two documents, I want to submit for your consideration, only 0.96 commission is paid on the value mentioned therein and they relate to Svenska; they are not related to 'Lotus'.

In the end, all that I want to submit is, on an evaluation that I have made of the documents with some degree of indignation and some degree of distress, would any person who has not lost his thinking faculty ever think that these documents should be relied upon for alleging something in Parliament. If this debate is taken seriously, these documents should never have been fallen back upon for a debate in Parliament, nor should have been the reports in the papers which have been taken up It is as a result of this that the Opposition has kept itself where it is

Now an alliance has come—an alliance has come of different people, I do not know which ideology they profess. I do not know what is the common philosophy I do not know what is the end and purpose except that they want removal of Rajiv Gandhi and the Congress. This is what earlier the other parties has tried to do And all such parties had got together and they all came back from where they started, they went back to from where they started That is the fate which awaits all these parties.

What I submit is that we need a strong Opposition A strong Opposition is only the surest guarantee of a strong democracy. But we cannot think of a strong Opposition as long as the unprincipled, unscrupulous, ruthless and dishonest politicians are going to head the Opposition. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir,...

डा० (श्रीमती) नाजमा हेपतुल्ला (महाराष्ट्र) : जिसने एलिगेशन लगाया है, वह तो चले गए (व्यवधान)...

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Madam, have you finished? Can I start now?

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I charge the Government with suppressing the facts and misleading the Parliament of India...

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: But not corruption.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH:....and, for allowing corrupt practices to take place in acquiring the defence requirements of our country. Mr. Salve started his defence with what Mr V. P. Singh is reported to have stated in the other House. Mr. Salve's whole argument stood on Mr. V. P. Singh's disclosure of the documents or Mr. V. P. Singh's statement. Sir, I know, it happens, since the Bofors ghost started haunting the ruling party. Now, still, Mr. V. P. Singh is haunting them. So they can't overrule what Mr. V. P. Singh states.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: He is now haunting you also.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: But, Sir, Mr. V. P. Singh issued the statement on 4th of November, and it appeared in the newspaper on 5th and 6th and, up to 11th of November. The Prime Minister himself had given an interview to the *Sunday* magazine of Calcutta on 28th and 29th of October, but this interview was published later. It was published on 13th of November—though the interview was given on 28th of October It is now written in the interview itself. In the interview itself, the Prime Minister had admitted that commission was paid and maybe, for the better work done by Bofors. I will be quoting—I have got a copy, I don't know

whether they will refute this. The interview is a reproduction of taperecordings of the statement.

Sir, on April 17, 1987, the Government had first made a statement on the floor of both the Houses of Parliament that there was no commission agent and that no commission was paid. Even the Prime Minister himself had stated that he got it authenticated from the late Mr. Olof Palme, the then Prime Minister of Sweden, that there was no commission agent and no commission was paid. That was the starting point. We have to judge these documents not simply from the point of view of a Chartered Accountant. These documents mean disclosure of fresh evidence about payment of commission in the Bofors gun deal. So, it has to be looked at and examined from the point of view of a Member of Parliament representing the people of our country and not from the point of view of a Chartered Accountant defending a party who or which has employed him as a Chartered Accountant.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Not as Defence Minister ..*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): He is not employed: he is an honourable Members of this House.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: On the floor of this House it was denied by the Prime Minister himself that there was no commission agent and no commission was paid. He got it authenticated by his talk with Mr. Olof Palme. These are all on record. Then the Resolution came.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Mr. Ghosh, the time is very much limited.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: What I charge them with is suppression of fact, concealment of fact and misleading of the House. I start with this.

Then came the Resolution of the Working Committee of the AICC(I)—the theory of destabilization. Then, certain disclosures, certain revelations made by the National Audit Bureau of Sweden had led them to change their stand. The ruling party or, the Governmnet, changed their stand. Then came the theory that in the matter of commission no Indian was involved. Then came the question that it was not commission but winding-up charges. On what the JPC had stated, during the last session while debating on the JPC report or rather concluding the debate, our Defence Minister, Mr. Pant, said that this entire debate would end because the JPC had done a splendid job. What a splendid job it did! The JPC stated that there was no commission, no commission agent, that it was winding-up charge and that a winding-up charge could be taken and that no Indian was involved. Even now Mr. Salve has stated that there is no question of asking the money back. Now I say what Mr. Prime Minister had stated in his interview.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): I don't think, Mr. Salve said like that.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Yes. You can check up the record.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): I don't think so. You check up the record.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Mr. Prime Minister was asked, "But 64 crores? For industrial espionage?" Mr. Prime Minister replied:

> "There are three or four payments. Could be ..I am not saying it is... The whole thing may not be... hypothetically I am saying the whole amount could have been paid for genuine work. Then we can't question it. If the money has been paid for. ."

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN (Tamil Nadu): It is hypothetical.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: But listen.

> "...as a commission and it has not come to any Indian..."

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Let him speak.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Yes, one can say hypothetically. You can say hypothetically you do not exist here.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Are we going to have a parliamentary debate on a hypothetical question Are we going to waste the time of the House on a hypothetical question?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): You cannot change his understanding.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: He says:

"... and it has not come to any Indian and no Indian is involved and it has gone back to.. "

It is incomplete.

"...I don't know who on the other side."

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): You are quoting from the magazine only.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: It has not been denied. It has been tape-recorded. If you say it is wrong, I will sit down. The Prime Minister is not here. Otherwise, I could have asked him to authenticate.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): It is a quotation from a magazine only.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: What is wrong?

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: It is a taped interview published on the basis of taped record.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: What is wrong? He has the right to quote.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): All right.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: O. K. Then he says:

"Then again we can be upset that we have paid 66 crores extra."

All these things are there. By inference at least one week ago before Mr. V. P. Singh disclosed something, even the Prime Minister himself has admitted to the pressmen in this interview to the "SUNDAY" magazine that commission had been paid.

So long it was being said like that. Then where do we stand? Mr. Salve was charging Mr. V. P. Singh of changing colour this way and that way, speaking untruth, all these things. But under affirmation a Minister while making a statement on the floor of Parliament on April 17, 1987 said that stern action would be taken if it was proved that a commission was paid.

Then my first question is whether the Government is going to take stern action against Bofors which has paid the commission as it has been admitted by the Prime Minister himself. The action against the person who has taken the commission is different. That has to be proved. But it has been proved that Bofors has paid commission which was not to be paid according to the contract. Now, Mr. Salve, while examining the invoices said that the invoices which have been produced or rather disclosed through newspapers by Mr. V. P. Singh, do not *inter alia* say that they were in connection with that gun deal. It was his contention. But he could not say that the invoices do not suggest that the commission was paid by Bofors to Svenska or Pitco or Moresco. He had to construct his argument by saying that in the body of the invoice it was not written that the commission was paid on account of supply of so and so guns to the Indian Government. But what is written here? It is written "commission on material supplied to the Government of India according to our invoice so and so"; "Commission due to you an material supplied to the Secretary, Government of India, Ministry of Defence, according to our invoice so and so". Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, you were also in this field as Mr. Salve has declared it. So, the question is whether on these commission invoices details of the deals are mentioned or not. It has mentioned only the invoice number, date, order

number under which materials were supplied. These documnets show the commission paid on account of supplies of materials under so and so invoice number, dated so and so and order number so and so dated so and so. So, if numbers of invoices are examined, one can come to know which type of materials were supplied by the Bofors to the Government of India, Ministry of Defence and for which this particular commission was paid. So, I start from what Mr. Salve suggested. That is why I had put a question to Mr Salve: Did Bofors supply any other material not connected with that gun deal? And if so, whether the payment of the commission was allowed by the Government of India to Bofors on account of the supplies of such and such materials. He wanted to say that Gurupadaswamy showed certain documents which did not contain *inter alia* Bofors' supply of guns and other things, but if you examine these things you will find that it has mentioned *inter alia* invoice number under which such deliveries were made on account of which commission was paid. Examination of those invoices will reveal the truth. But pending examination of such invoices I want to put a question in the context of what Mr. Salve has stated: Whether Bofors had supplied to India any other material not connected with that gun-deal to the Defence Ministry and whether in such a deal payment of commission was allowed by the Government of India? I want to know this because we have been told so long that since 1984 the payment of commission in the defence deal or whatever material that is supplied on account of the supplies has been eliminated.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): But if the contract was before 1984?

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: So, naturally Mr. Salve's argument could not prove that there was no commission.

Now Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the question is why commission was given? Even the Prime Minister has stated earlier and in the interview also that no Indian was involved. So, why was the commission paid? It must have been either to influence the buyer to secure the order. Why commission is paid by a supplier?

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Not necessarily.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Not necessarily. You know better. You are a lowyer. All right, let me explain.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: The PM has made clear on that.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: O.K. Not necessarily. I quote the word 'not necessarily'.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Sometimes we do not know whether the equipment is available or not. That is why the commission agents will go to the market and find out.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: I order to sell certain things in competition with other sellers I am to give commission to somebody who will act on my behalf to secure the orders or to facilitate the sale of my goods, my commodities at a price which is more than the competitive price.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Sometimes even buyers also give commission. We do not know whether the commodity is available or not.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: But what the JPC has stated? JPC had come to a categorical conclusion that no commission was paid but it was winding up charges. It was not paid to influence the buyers. Is it so?

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: Not to influence the decision-making.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: The JPC had stated that it was winding up charges and it was not connected with the influencing of these things, it did not influence the order, it was the best buy and it was the best price. Let me see what our Prime Minister has stated to the "Sunday" magazine. When a specific question was asked, he said, I quote:

[Shri Dipen Ghosh]

"To the best of my knowledge, money has not been used to influence the decision-making process".

But the JPC's investigation report is a conclusive fact...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): What is the date of issue of "Sunday" magazine?

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: The magazine's date is 13—19 November, 1988. The interview was given on the 28th and the 29th October, 1988 to this magazine.

So, Mr. Panigrahi, during the last session we were told that the JPC has done a splendid job and with the conclusion of the JPC report everything is clear and everything is set right. When the JPC's conclusion was it was winding up charges, it had nothing to do with the securing of orders, etc. etc., influencing the decision-making process and JPC had taken as lily-white truth what the Bofors representatives have stated to them, to change tyres etc.. Win Chadha was paid so much money. But it is the Prime Minister who still said "To the best of my knoldege." What does it mean? Still he has a doubt in his mind. Even JPC has quoted..

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: You are reading it out of the context. You read the whole thing. You are readng just one sentence.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: It is not out of context. I am quoting the question and he is replying. You have not read the interview. That is my misfortune

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: Every line you are quoting, I am noting down whether you are quoting or misquoting, everything.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Then, I am quoting a little earlier. "If our assessment is that we got a good price, then, we really need to chase only the fact whether an Indian has made money or whether money has been used to influence the decision-making which would be too very serious thing." Now his reply "To the best of my knowledge, it was not paid to influence the decision-making process."

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: Dipen Babu, you are such a reasonable and good hon. Member, may I tell you?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Even for a good discussion, it is better if that point is made clear.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: No, no. He will speak later. Naturally when one has got some doubt in his mind he says with that clause. If the Prime Minister himself could not take the JPC's report as wholly acceptable... *(Interruption)*...

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I may bring.. *(Interruption)*...

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: I am not yielding. Another sentence in the same paragraph, and I quote:

"So far, we have not been able to establish ...."

That means, still the situation is there which warrants further investigation. *(Interruption)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Mr. Dipen Ghosh, we also give certificate where we always write "to the best of my knowledge". *(Interruption)*.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: I do not know why he is stretching it so far. Sir, you read the whole thing. *(Interruption)*.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: You are opposing the enquiry proposed by Mr. Gurupadaswamy.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: Whenever you say anything.. *(Interruption)*..

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Mr. Ghosh, be just and fair.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: All right. That is why, I say... *(Interruption)*.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra): Sir, I am on a point of order. I would request you that in the present debate, he is quoting from some magazine. It is for the Government to say yes or no. But, Sir, I would beg of you that the Chair should not call for the magazine. It is worthless. (*Interruption*). Sir, I beg of you, the convention is the Chair should not give credit to a magazine which any Member may be holding. It is bible for him, not for us.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): I do not give. I wanted to find out the context... (*Interruption*)...

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Sir, you are an umpire. It is not necessary for you to go into the details.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): All right.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Why I am quoting? I am quoting from his interview to carry home the argument that still the situtation as obtaining today, requires further indepth investigation. When the Prime Minister himself takes recourse to such specious cliche, such clauses, no-responsibility clauses; "to the best of my knowledge...so far, the truth has not been established or this has not been established", what does it mean?

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: The Government has said, the CBI is looking into it. Therefore, the Prime Minister had to say it.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Mr. Panigrahi, that reply has been given by Mr. Pant. Even after that he says it.

Now, Sir, another point. During the last Session, Mr. Arun Singh had stated and you know, Mr. Salve has again controverted his statement. Mr. Arun Singh wanted either to ask Bofors to pay back the money or to blacklist it, and the question is, when it has been proved that the commission has been paid, violating the agreement because the agreemnt was that no commission would be paid, yet, Bofors had paid commission. It has been proved. The Prime Minister himself has admitted. Even he admitted that he had to accept the political beating. While defending not to blacklist, not to cancel the contract, not to ask to pay back the money, in his own argument, he has said, "in the interest of the defence of these things and those things.." because he said I accept the political beating. What does it mean?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): But you say what you want now.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: That means Bofors had paid the commission contravening the Government's agreement and it also means that the Prime Minister, the Defence Minister and every other Minister, who spoke on this during the last debate had suppressed the truth, had misled the House. This is my charge against the Prime Minister. (*Interruption*)...

(SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: It is completely wrong.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: When he had said that no commission was paid, he had verified it, he had authenticated it from Olof Palme. He brought Olof Palme's name to appear here also. Now, he says, yes, it was there. At this stage of... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI DEBA PRASAD RAY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the Prime Minister's interview has been distorted. (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): It all depends on what type of information it was and at what point of time. Provided it is proved... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI DEBA PRASAD RAY: Let him read out the portion from the interview itself as to what the Prime Minister has said on the issue of asking Bofors to pay back the money

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Mr Ray, Mr Anand Sharma is there to speak next. Other

[Shri Jagesh Desai]

Members are also there. They will take care of it. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I make this point for you. At a given point of time, one speak something. But since then, the Government has not yet come out with such a statement as to say that on so and so dates such and such things happened. These were stated in the background of whatever information they had got. But they had stated it as the absolute truth. They stated it as if they were speaking the absolute truth. Even the Joint Parliamentary Committee had spoken in that sense as though that is the absolute truth. The Joint Parliamentary Committee had stated that there was no commission but only winding-up charges. Now Mr. Vice-Chairman, Mr. Salve has stated...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : You forget about Mr. Salve. Make your point.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : Why should I forget Mr. Salve ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : You have already taken 28 minutes. That is why.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : The question was another, whether we should ask Bofors to pay back the money. Mr. Salve said, "No". Again I quote, Mr. Panigrahi, from Mr. Rajiv Gandhi's interview.

> "There is the option about asking for the money back. That is still open."

When the Prime Minister says that the option is still open to ask for the money back, Mr. Salve says 'no'.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : He may give his own opinion.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : He may say so. My question is: Will the Government tell us when, after which type of investigation, the Government is going to ask Bofors to pay the money back ? Even if I do not say that the contract has to be nullified, the Prime Minister has said that the option to ask Bofors to pay the money back is still open. So, naturally, we are entitled to know the answer because it is the country's money, it is the people's money. Nobody should be allowed to swindle the people's money. So, when is the Government going to ask Bofors to pay the money back? I know what Mr. Minister will say.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : Please do not assume.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : I am not assuming. Mr. Pant has stated last time in this House that the C.B.I. has been asked to investigate. In the interview itself it was said that Mohan Katre was sent to Sweden to talk to their officials there. And he has admitted that the C.B.I. investigation is going on. (*Interruption*). But, pending the C.B.I. investigation—C.B.I. is supplementary force to help him—another impartial Joint Parliamentary Committee probe can be done. Why I am saying this is—he is laughing—(*Interruptions*). Further disclosures of documents... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI : No new disclosure has been made.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Including the disclosures made in the interview given by the Prime Minister to the 'Sunday' magazine, it has been proved.. (*Interruptions*)...that the J.P.C. could not deliver the goods. The JPC report could not go near the truth. The fact that the Government says, Mr. Panigrahi says, the Prime Minister himself says, that the CBI is investigating it afresh proves that the JPC headed by Mr. Shankaranand has failed, has miserably failed, to go near the truth. So my demand is this. Last time also I made this demand. The CBI may have an independent method of investigation. But the CBI as such is not independent of the Government. Therefore, let there be a Joint Parliamentary Committee headed by an Opposition Member and let that Committee be asked to get at the truth. This is necessary because Mr. Salve was saying about Mr. V. P. Singh. I am not holding a brief for Mr. V. P. Singh. Mr. V. P. Singh made certain charges and obviously those charges have to be proved. It enjoins upon the person making those charges to

authenticate, to affirm, those charges. When certain charges are being made against a high person in a high place, a dignitary, an important person in Goverment, the Prime Minister himself here, it enjoins upon the person making those charges to prove the charges beyond doubt. Similarly the person who is in a high place and against whom a charge is made, is also expected to prove himself innocent beyond doubt...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : How can it be ? Supposing somebody says this account is yours, how can you prove...

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : It depends on the person against whom the charge is made. That is why the account number has been given. Let the Government come out with the truth in whose name the account stands. You have an agreement with the Swiss Government. Under that agreement, in order to dispel every doubt, in order to prove that the Opposition leaders were wrong, let the Government take upon itself the responsibility of telling the nation that so-and-so account number is in the name of so-and-so person or so-and-so firm, so that the people will understand, will come to know, that this was wrong. Until and unless the Government comes out with this information, the people will continue saying that there is something wrong in the whole deal. That is why I say the responsibility lies with the Government. Let there be a Joint Parliamentary probe: let the Government come out with further information about that account number. Thank you.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is indeed unfortunate that for the third time this year this august House is once again discussing a subject which has been discussed earlier and the position of the Government, the truth of the matter has been amply made clear. There has been nothing new in the intervening period which could have justified this present discussion. Mr. Dipen Ghosh, who was speaking just before me and who has now left the House, has once again gone in for a motivated campaign along with his other colleagues in the Opposition to keep the controversy alive, the only objective, the only motive of the charges, baseless accusations, which have been made in the newspapers and denied later, the prevarications Mr. V. P. Singh, a person with a fickle mind who comes up with astonishing information from his electronic memory.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H HANUMANTHAPPA) in the Chair].

But within 48 hours the electronic memory changes. The account number changes and the holder of the account also changes. And that information which, according to the accuser himself, is not new but happens to be what was discussed last time in this House; the document published by the Hindu newspaper, published along with the JPC Report to affect the credibility of the JPC which had genuinely made sincere efforts on the basis of the all available information to ascertain the truth to find out the identity of the recipients and to inform the people about what the reality was.

Sir, I am very sorry to say that the Opposition today on one hand charges the Government with hiding the truth, but when it charges the Government of corrupt practices, it also demands that a fresh JPC be constituted headed by the Opposition. I start from here. What moral right do they have to demand a fresh JPC, and that also by saying that it should be headed by them? Do you mean to suggest that all the Members sitting on this side, whether in Rajya Sabha or in Lok Sabha are unreliable you are questioning our integrity? You are questioning our attempts to unearth the truth? You are trying to give yourself a certificate. But you are also trying to castigate us. I strongly object to this, Sir.

Sir, the Government and we are all more concerned than they to find out what actually happened because it is in their interest that the truth does not come out. It is in our interest that this controversy ends once for all. Sir, these friends are showing so much of enthusiasm and also creating an erroneous impression that they genuinely want to find out what has happened.

Sir, if we go by the sequence of events, right from 17th April, 1987 till date, the sequence will be that always it has been

[Shri Anand Sharma]

the Government and the Prime Minister who have made every possible effort to get at the truth. Sir, when the Swedish Radio came out with the story, it was the Government which brought the issue before Parliament. It was again the Government of India—the Prime Minister, yes; his statements have been referred to. The Prime Minister had said: We will not spare anybody, we will punish the guilty. Yes, Sir. The Government had also said initially that the middlemen were not there. What is wrong with the statement? The Prime Minister had only stated that the Government took a conscious decision to exclude middlemen. It was the first time that this decision was taken. Had there been no such decision to exclude the middlemen or commission agents, then where was the controversy? And then he said that a guarantee was given. This was corroborated by the Swedish Government. It is not only late Olof Palme but even the present Swedish Government. The present Prime Minister of Sweden has also said: yes, this understanding was arrived at between the Government of India and the Government of Sweden. The Under Secretary of Trade who recorded the minutes of the meetings has also said so. So where is the dispute about that? But the Prime Minister also said on that day—I remember this distinctly—that despite this if there is anything of that sort which has happended, we will not spare anybody, and he appealed to the Opposition and appealed to the media, saying: you get us evidence, not the proof, and we shall take action. Till this date,

4 P.M.

Sir, between 17th of April 1987 and 15th of November 1988, none of these worthies have come up on their own, neither they nor their leaders, with any evidence which they sometimes claim they are in possession of, neither the authors of those stories who had charged on the Swedish Radio and later through various newspapers. Sir, it was this Government—I would like to remind you—which impressed upon, which prevailed upon the Government to Sweden to institute an inquiry by the Swedish Audit Bureau, and whatsoever we discussed later is based upon the findings of the SNAB What we received in June was made public. It was shown to the Opposition leaders, and the Government declared its intention to have a parliamentary inquiry. So the basis of parliamentary inquiry was provided by the Government. The *prima facie* case was made out by the Government, with Government efforts. The credit for finding whatsoever has come out belongs to Rajiv Gandhi and this Government, to nobody else. Sir, it was at this juncture that the Government invited the Opposition to join the JPC. But they were not interested in finding out the truth, because they knew what the truth was. They knew that the Government was committed to the security interests of the country. They knew that the Prime Minister was above board. It was a deliberate campaign, a systematic campaign, for political purposes, a campaign of disinformation, and slanders. Sir, I know, when I use strong words, the words I have to use, it is with anguish. But those people who claim that they are going to provide an alternative system, an alternative to the Government, an alternative leadership, utter* What should I call them, if not* (*Interruptions*) Sir, when the report of the Audit Bureau came, there were certain... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM (Tamil Nadu): * * He can quote, but he cannot use...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: What should I call them? Yes, I will call them...

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: The same opportunity should be given to others also. We will also say that the Prime Minister has ... (*Interruptions*) You must accept that. He has a right to say so if somebody has referred to it. But he is alleging, he is saying, that it is a * It is his opinion, not a reference...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): If there is a direct allegation, I will look into it.

---

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: You follow my argument. If he refers to a speech or anything, that is different. But he is charging that it is a". That is his opinion. That is what I am saying.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: As I was saying, even when the SNAB report was received there were certain portions excised from it—excised because the Swedish laws, because commercial confidentiality was claimed by the Bofors management. But the Government of India was not satisfied even with that report. The correspondence between the Ministry of Defence and Bofors and the Swedish Government will clearly establish that the Government of India till this day kept on insisting that the Swedish Government makes available the excised portions of the report so that we can get more information. But Sir, on the basis of the report which was made available, the JPC was constituted. The Opposition members who had themselves demanded the JPC were looking for excuses. If I remember correctly, at their instance even the terms of reference of the JPC were changed. But even then they did not join, for obvious reasons. After that, when the JPC report came out, it is clear, they are virtually castigating the JPC. And I object to this, because they are esteemed members of Indian Parliament, of both these Houses. They are my colleagues here. They have made efforts. They have worked hard. You look at their report. Even about these accounts which they are referring to or about which there is a reference in the Hindu documents, there is a reference in the JPC report. Even the total amount and the accounts have been referred to. When they talk of winding-up charges, this is not something which we have coined. This is not something which we speak about. This is something which has been said by the Swedish National Audit Bureau. A certificate to this effect has been given by their Public Acountant. It is all there in the JPC report. I need not quote the excerpts which have been discussed in the past. But the Government of India has never accepted this position.

There is one aspect about the weapon system we purchased, whether the weapon system was purchased at a higher cost, whether we have lost our money and whether the so-called commissions or winding-up charges or termination costs claimed by Bofors or Swedish National Audit Bureau have influenced the contract. Now, this is the crux of the matter. If my memory serves me right, it was in 1984 when the Defence authorities submitted their requirement along with the prices quoted by various companies to the C.C.P.A. The price which was approved in 1984 was Rs. 1600 crores. In 1986, the contract was signed for Rs. 200 crores less. Given the fluctuations of currency, one can only say, if one has to be honest, that the Government should be given credit for ensuring such a stiff competitive or for generating that competition to ensure competitive prices for us. If the money which is referred to has not gone from us, then what the supplier actually does with the profits is his business. It is none of our business. This is one aspect. They quote the Prime Minister out of context. Mr. Dipen Ghosh was saying that the P.M. has said this in the enterview. P.M. has admitted. Now, it was a hypothetical observation of the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister has said that to the best of his knowledge, money has not been used to influence the decision-making process. He has also said that so far we have not been able to establish whether money has been given to any Indian. Now, the investigation is still continuing. The C.B.I. approached the Swiss Government. We got two things going with the Swedish Governments. We started talking to them of a treaty. What this means is that the CBI is investigating as was assured by the Government. During the last debate when documents were brought up by the Hindu We had said that the CBI would look into it. In addition to that, the Government has taken another step. As per the Prime Minister, the Government has been negotiating with the Swedish Government a treaty so that more information is made available to us. Here they are once again bringing it up and distorting

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

[*Shri* Anand Sharma]

even what the Prime Minister has said. I take strong objection to another remark by Mr. Dipen Ghosh when he said about the Prime Minister admitting that 'I am willing to take a beating, I am willing to take a beating'. Either he does not understand the English language or he is being deliberately mischievous and malicious. (*Interruptions*) He knows it. He knows what the Prime Minister has said. He has said that if we go ....(*Interruptions*) I will quote what he has said. He has said that there are demands of cancellation of contract. There are demands of penalising Bofors. My memory is fortunately good and I can quote him from memory. It will quote it. (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Please allow him to continue.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: That is what he says and that is what the truth is. There are certain provisions in any contract, particularly a contract of this magnitude, of this importance that when you arbitrarily cancel a contract, you have to pay penalty. A particular percentage of contract you have to pay as compensation to the other party. In addition to that, Sir, you have to start the whole exercise afresh, you have to invite fresh tenders, you have to locate the possible suppliers, and then enter into negotiations. So, on the one hand, you deprive the Indian Army and the nation of this weapon system for another couple of years; last time, it took nine long years to clinch this particular deal; God alone knows what international interests may crop up which may prevent India from acquiring the weapon system. In addition to that, Sir, we are bound to pay more. If we buy something in 1990, we are bound to pay much more. So, the Prime Minister has said that it is better that I take the political beating because of this motivated campaign of lies and slander rather than the nation getting a beating where the Army does not have the weapon which it badly needs. You should salute the Prime Minister for making that remark than accusing him. What is wrong? I am proud of a Prime Minister who says that I can take the beating but I will not allow India to take the beating because he is a patriot, he is a nationalist. And here I would like to say, Sir, that it is tragic that this House has to discuss for the fifth time this matter. Can we allow these Houses of Indian Parliament or this august House to become an instrument of political slander? Can we allow political campaigns or election manifestoes to evolve out of these discussions? Those people who are directionless, who lack manifestos, who lack programme of action, they are sticking to it like their Bible because the present exercise of Mr. V. P. Singh has been described by my esteemed colleague, Mr. Salve, before me...(*Interruptions*) I am not referring to the details of those documents. But if you want, I can educate you. Those documents were the same which I referred to in the last debate. You read my list speech. I do not want to waste the time on that. They were published by the 'Hindu'. V. P. Singh has contradicted himself. On 5th November, he says, this is the Lotus account number, and of Shri Rajiv Gandhi. He should hang his head in shame for saying that because on 7th of November at Lucknow, the same gentleman comes up with another statement that these are the documents which were published by the 'Hindu', and that this is Svenska account and not Lotus account. Today, in Parliament, when he is asked to own it up, he runs away from that. What is the character of that individual? (*Interruptions*) To whom he is teaching morals? (*Interruptions*)

श्री राम नरेश यादव (उत्तर प्रदेश) : अगर यही बात थी तो प्रधान मंत्री को यहां पर लाना चाहिए था ... (**व्यवधान**) ...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, Mr. V. P Singh is very fond of talking in crores. He has declared his personal assets. This Fakir of Janata Dal or Jan Morcha has declared his personal assets of Rs. 7 crores. Those are the immovable assets. How many movable assets are there? If

I have to be that irresponsible as these people, if I say that this particular account he had, how can you deny? (*Interruptions*) But that is not their plea. (*Interruptions*). Sir, what I am only trying to say is that India is a great country. India has been respected for its traditions, for its culture, for its customs. India today is witnessing a scenario where power-hungry people who have been repeatedly rejected by the India masses because of their greed, because of their lust of power, because of the fact that they do not have any substance in them, they are resorting to one of the ugliest campaigns to destroy established institutions. When I say institutions, Sir, the Prime Minister of India is an institution. It is after great struggle, great sacrifices that we built up these institutions, the institutions which are an integral part of Parliamentary democracy. These institutions must not be allowed to be destroyed overnight, this is my submission, and for the Opposition, it will do you a lot of good, if you do some self-introspection. (*Time bell rings*) Nothing prevented them or their so-called confidential sources, electronic sources elsewhere to place this information either before the JPC or before this Parliament, or V. P. Singh could have done today in the Lok Sabha or their patrons could have done before the Swedish authorities. Whatsoever they have said, it is a lie and they must be condemned for it and certainly they all are not qualified to question the credibility of a Prime Minister who is the custodians of a great culture of the Indian National Congress and the legacy of the Nehrus. I repeat myself and I have said it earlier that this is the family which is known and respected for its contribution and sacrifices and this Prime Minister today he lives for this country from moment to moment, from the day he has accepted this responsibility. It is shameful that a leader who loves his nation, even his love for the country is being questioned by those who have yet to prove their own credentials and that they do not have extra-territorial loyalties. Thank you.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I may not agree with all the lavish praise myfriend, Mr. Anand Sharma, showered on his boss and the leader. But ...(*Interruptions*). If you disturb me, I will have to use harsh words. But I must say one thing that the conscience of the Prime Minister has started pricking him at last and in his search for self-revelation, statements nearer the truth have started coming out of his mouth. The Bangalore statement was one of them. Because from his stand that there was no middleman at all, from his stand that nothing was paid, then from his stand that even if something was paid it was only a winding up charge, to admit that a commission has been paid and he never denied payment of the commission, is a great progress. But the only thing is that while he made a categorical statement in Bangalore on November 10, that he never denied payment of commissions, his Government spokesman issued a statement next day, that PM did not mean it. And even the denial had no sense because it was neither categorical nor it covers up the Prime Minister's statement. It was a bland denial. Probably the country would have taken the denial but for a very elaborate interview given by the Prime Minister to Sunday, in which he justified payment of the Commission, if it is for a genuine purpose. Therefore there is a contradiction again it is the Government's stand on the same. And I need not mention about the stands taken by his Ministers. One Minister who was honest enough to stand by his statement had to resign because he told the Parliament that nothing was paid and there was no middleman and when he found that there was a middleman and something was paid, he honourably quit. So, I only wish that Mr. Chintamani Panigrahi, who is another good man, will not make such wrong statements and will not face the same consequences. And the Defence Minister asserted in this House and taunted the Opposition also for making .

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: You are misquoting the whole thing.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: . . irresponsible statements that payments have been made. And Mr. Shiv Shanker had a very elaborate argument how the money flowed back to the directors of the Bofors themselves. Therefore, there were

[Shri Parvathaneni Upendra]

contradictory statements from the Ministers themselves. And in the Parliament itself, the Prime Minister also, in the earlier stages, made such varied statements. He said one thing to army commanders; he said something else about the Swedish Prime Minister's assertions, and subsequently changed the same statement. He has been shifting his stand very often. Even when he met opposition leaders, he said something in that meeting. But the question is, today he justifies payment of commission if it is genuine. At the same time he forgets that according to agreement, any payment of commission is prohibited, whether it is for genuine purpose or bogus purpose. On what basis can he justify that for genuine purpose, the commission can be paid? Where was it written? When the agreement specifically prohibits employment of middlemen and payment of commission or any charges, how can he justify today that if it is for genuine purpose, it can be done. This itself is wrong. And who judges whether it is for genuine purpose or not. That is why I want to say, in this strip-tease act which the Government is performing, only the under-garments remain now and the day is not far off when the naked truth will come out.

And if the Prime Minister knew that commission was paid, according to him for genuine purposes, why was this fact not made known to the JPC? It is not today only; these documents came out much earlier, even before the JPC submitted its report, and the Prime Minister must have known about them. When he knew that payment was made, and if he was convinced that it was for genuine purpose ,why was it not made known to JPC and why was he still justifying and telling all these months that no payments were made? If it was for genuine purpose, why could he not justify it earlier? That itself shows that having failed in all attempts to cover up the truth, and when things started coming out, even including bank account numbers etc., he takes the alibi that if it is for genuine purpose it can be paid. That is very wrong. And even about Bofors whom he justifies in his interview that agreement cannot be cancelled, legally it is not permissible, or military-wise it is undesirable, he forgets to what extent Bofors went in misleading the Parliament and misleading the Parliamentary Committee and everybody. I will only quote one or two sentences as an illustration. JPC said finally in its report: "There is no evidence to show that any middleman was involved in the process of acquisition of Bofors guns. There is also no evidence to substantiate the allegation of commision or bribe having been paid to anyone. Therefore, the question of payment to any Indian or Indian company, whether resident in India or not, does not arise, especially when no evidence to the contrary is forthcoming from any quarter." This is what JPC report says on page 191. Then I quote from page 111 of the JPC report on Bofors representatives. It says: "In their telex message dated 15th May 1987, A. B. Bofors stated, interalia, 'The contract signed by the Indian Minister of Defence with A. B. Bofors on March 24, 1986, contains no clause concerning payment of commission. Neither does there exist any contract with India, neither between Indian Government nor any other Indian party and A. B. Bofors to provide for payment of commission in connection with winning the said contract. The allegation on Swedish Radio on May 13, 1987 that A. B. Bofors informed Swedish Central Bank that payment of commission to Indian agents was part of the Indian contract, is entirely wrong.'" That is the Bofors' categorical statement.

Again, when they appeared before the Parliamentary Committee, they repeated the same thing again that no commission had been paid, that they had not paid anything. This clearly shows that Bofors had misled the Government, misled the Parliamentary Committee and this is enough reason to go in for cancellation of the contract and ask for damages. I do not know why the Government is not taking recourse to this step. The Prime Minister and the Government have to explain.

My friend, Mr. Anand Sharma, said that Opposition has not been able to produce evidence. What more evidence you need? The Government agrees, the Bofors company agrees, the Joint Parliamentary Committee agrees, that Rs. 64 crores have changed hands. Whose duty it is to prove? Today, there is a cloud of suspicion hanging over the head of this country's Government and accusations are being made repeatedly, names of banks are given and account numbers are quoted. Is it not the duty and the responsibility of the Government to find out where these sixty-four crores of rupees have gone? Is it for the Opposition to prove? Is it for the newspapers to prove? Then, what for your investigating agencies are there? What for the Government machinery is there? What for your embassies are there? Is it not your duty? When the charge is against you, when the suspicion is about you, it is your duty to prove that it is not so. Unless you prove it, unless you come out as to who has taken this money, we are perfectly justified, the country is justified, the Press is justified, in making such accusations against anybody in this land. It is for you to prove. You are the head of the Government. You have to prove.

Again, in the interview, he says—it is very strange—'to the best of my knowledge, money has not been used to influence the decision-making process: so far we have not been able to establish whether money has come to any Indian'. To the question 'did you try hard enough?' he says 'We have tried very hard; we have not finished trying.' I do not know what to call this. I do not know call this Government. It is corrupt all right. But it is such an incompetent Government that it cannot find out as to whom the money has gone. I give the benefit of doubt to anybody about this matter. I do not want to accuse X or Y. But it is your fundamental duty to find out as to who has taken this money. If you are not capable of that, you have to face this kind of innuendos and you have to face the music. You cannot say that it is not your duty to prove the Opposition has to prove, the Press has to prove. You may say so now But one day it will be proved. One day when you will be quitting the Government and some other Government will come to power, everything will be proved, everything will come out and you will have to face the consequences then. Till such time, it is the responsibility of the Government, it is your responsibility, to prove that money has not gone to you but to somebody else. You have admitted that money has been paid. Nobody is denying that money has been paid. It is for you to prove and tell us as to where this money has gone. Therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman, until that is done, it will be presumed that commission has been paid to those in high positions. The charge wll remain. We will stand by the charge whoever is making the charge.

Sir, the Prime Minister owes an apology to this House for misleading this House repeatedly about payment of commission. Decency requires that the Prime Minister should come before the House and say on behalf of the Government that this House has been misled, the other House has been misled and that the nation has been misled. Parliament's sanctity has to be maintained. It is also very strange that some responsible Ministers rushed to the Press with their tatements without any information in their possession. I do not appreciate responsible Ministers going to the Press and blandly issuing a statement that it is not correct. If you have facts, you have to come out with them. Parliament is the forum. You have to come before Parliament and tell us. Simply because Mr. Narasimha Rao or Mr. Shiv Shanker or Mr. Chavan or some other Minister comes out with a statement in the Press, the nation is not going to believe it. Today, even a small child does not believe the Prime Minister. We know what children are saying on the radio and television. Therefore, do not try to fool the people. The people are not going to be folled by you. The successive elections have proved this. They have proved what the people are thinking about you. The coming elections will also prove what the people think about you. One responsible Minister even invents a bank account of Mr V. P. Singh. He also invents a name, saying 'universe'

[Shri Parvathaneni Upendra]

means "Vishwanath" He gives a code number.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Can you say that Mr. V. P. Singh has not invented?

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: You are the Government. Please come out with proof if you have anything against Mr. V. P. Singh. You have got the machinery. You prove it.

SHRI DARBARA SINGH: Mr. V. P. Singh has not come out with any proof. He has only made allegations.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Mr. Darbara Singh, you are a responsible person. It is for the Government to prove. You are the Government. If Shri V. P. Singh has an illegal account, you arrest him, produce the evidence and arrest him. Have you got the guts to do that? You do that. Who prevents you? Would you have kept quiet if you had the evidence in your hands? And Mr. Sathe is going to the press, saying that it is V. P's. account. It is not fair. He makes a frivolous charge. It is highly objectionable. (*Interruptions*).

Therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I only conclude by telling that we have talked enough on this. The truth will ultimately come out. Nobody can suppress the truth for ever. Their days are numbered. And when their days are numbered, when their turn comes, when they are thrown out, definitely the truth will come out. And when the truth comes out all these people, incuding their leader will have to face the consequences.

With these words I say that at least now the Prime Minister owes an apology to the House, it is his fundamental duty to come to the House and apologise for all the misleading statements he has made so far.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Mr. Vice-chairman sir, I thought that the most shameful day in the history of parliament occurred during the last session when my colleagues from the other side invaded the floor of the House and even came on this side of the House and made threatening gestures to the Chairman and refused to allow the proceedings of the House to continue. Now I find that if that was not the most shameful day in the history of Parliament it is probably today when once again we have taken up what has come out in the Press and spent hours and hours on the debate.

I do not want to go into the merits of the statement. Much has been said about the merits of the statement, much has been said about Bofors, so much has already been spoken by various speakers who spoke before me, but if you go back into the history of this, when the first allegation came and after it was denied strenuously, the loudest cries and the loudest pleas came from the Opposition for formation of a Joint Parliamentary Committee to go into the issue. When it was found after the audit Bureau,s report that somehing had transpired and when Government came forward in all earnestness to get at the truth of the matter, the Government begged and pleaded with the opposition to Join us in a Joint Parliamentary Cmmittee, it was the same opposition Members who decibed to boycott the Committee. At hat time if they were really interested in getting at the truth of the matter, they should have joined the Joint Parliamentary Committee. It was their solemn duty to join the JPC, but at that time they raised all kinds of trivial issues, all kinds of issues about who should be the Chairman about whether the Minister should be allowed to appead before the Committee. They raised every single procedural hurdel and refused to join even before the Committee was constituted. The Committee spent hours and hours of time going into every detail of the matter.If anyone of them had been present on that Committee,nothing could have prevented them form asking all the right questions form the persons who appeared before the Committee to get at the truth. but it was never their intention to get at the truth. After the Committee came out with its finding there was an end to the matter.

But then we came across once again during the last session documents Published by the *Hindu* and today and yesterday we find in the newspapers once again these statements by Mr. V.P. Singh which are an exact reproduction of what had appeared in the Hindu except Mr. V.P. Singh had never understood what the Hindu itself has said and has deliberately confused himself. He has tried to mislead the entire nation by giving a totally distorted picture of what actually happened. Without going into what he has actually said I would only like to say one thing. As a member of the JPC, when going through every single document that was placed before the Committee I found one thing. Mr. V. P. Singh was at that time the Finance Minister Every single document every part of the negotiation was before Mr. V. P. Singh. It was Mr. V. P. Singh who signed each and every document even before it went to the Prime Minister who was then Defence Minister. It was the finance Minister that cleared every part of the deal, every bit of the negotiation and it was only after the clearance of the Finance Minister and the signature of Shri V. P. Singh that everything came up before the Prime Minister who was also the Defence Minister at that time. If something was wrong, it is very strange that the man who actually signed every document, the man who was actually party to the deal has gone back on everything. He has not explained till today. How it was that when he singed every single document in this deal, as Finance Minister he takes no responsibility for that? And then he speaks with another voice today, coming out and saying that the whole deal was shady, that money has passed hands, that commissions have passed hands. I do not want to follow the example of my colleagues who have spoken before me I do not want to give newspaper and magazine reports unnecessary status by quoting them in this House. But taking what has been said by Mr. Upendra and Mr. Dipen Ghosh about what the Prime Minister has said—and they have criticised what the Prime Minister has said, when he said "to the best of my knowledge"— Sir, they have given their interpretation of what the Prime Minister has said, but according to my interpretation, when the Prime Minister says, "to the best of my knowledge" he probably means that Mr. V. P. Singh should know it because he was the Finance Minister at that time and if any commission had been paid and if anything had been done, he is the person who should be knowing, he is the person who should know the sources of bank accounts, which also makes Mr. Sathe's statement absolutely correct that he has a bank account which is called "Vishwa".

We have been talking so much in the last Session about the onus of proof. We have been talking so much about the Defamation Bill where everybody was screaming from the other side how it is for the prosecutor to take the onus of proof. Now how is it that responsible Members of the Opposition—so called—get up and make these wild and baseless allegations against the Prime Minister repeatedly without any regard for truth?

Sir, what happened in the other House this morning is painful evidence of the fact that this is an Opposition which is totally bereft of issues. I plead with the Opposition, if they want to go to the people with issues, let us take the serious issues of the people. Let them challenge the Government over these issues. Let them take the issue of floods, let them take the issue of hunger, let them take the issue of rising prices, for instance. Let them take all these issues and let us debate them. Let the time of this House be used to debate issues which are of crucial importance to the people. It is not as if corruption is not an issue. But this particular debate has gone on for such a long time. We have talked about it to the extent that the entire country came to another sad point in its history when the Prime Minister, because of all the forces of destabilisation that had launched together against him, had to get up in Parliament and in the interest of probity and decency in public life, make a solemn statement that he was in no way involved with corruption, that no member of his

([Smt. Jayanthi Natarajan]

family was involved in any kind of deal. And to this day, nobody has been come up with a scrap of evidence that could possibly connect the Prime Minister. On the other hand, in the other House today Mr. V.P. Singh was challenged--this is the entire basis of the debate on which all of us are talking—and asked to get up and authenticate what he had said. and he was unable to do it. He was sitting in the House. He was unable to do it. He went away from the House. (*Interruptions*) He was not able to do it, I reiterate it. He sat there in silence. (*Interruptions*) You can quote newspaper reports and I can quote what happened in the other House. He got up and went away. He was unable to do it.

Sir, this is the man. If you go back, you are talking about ceratin charges that newspapers for their own reasons have carried and given such extensive coverage. Who is the person who made these charges? This is the person. He was Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh and the moment things started going wrong there when the dacoit problem took over he resigned and ran away. This is the person who became a Member of Parliament in 1971 and after he became a Minister in 1975, he started amassing huge wealth. Even according to his own admission. he has flats and commercial complexes in Barakhamba Road. he has commercial complexes in Nehru Place, he has a huge farm in Mehrauli, he has a commercial complex in Kailash, he has vast amounts of money. This is the person. This is the person whose son became a non-resident Indian...

उर्जा मंत्रालय में विद्युत विभाग में राज्य मंत्री (श्री कल्पनाथ राय): ... (व्यवधान)

SHRI K. G. MAHESWARAPPA (Karnataka): Sir, on a point of order.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: I am not yielding. I am not yielding.

SHRI K. G. MAHESWARAPPA: Can a Minister call a Member **when he is not a Member of this House? He is a Minister. He must have some sense of proportion. He should withdraw it or it should be removed from the records.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: He is a**... (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Mr. Maheswarappa, please sit down.

*श्री के. सत्यनारायण रेड्डी: राजीव गांधी** है... (व्यवधान)

SHRI K. G. MAHESWARAPPA: Then everyone can call anybody anything. ... (*Interruptions*) ... The Minister is calling an honourable Member, our Party President, a ** Will you allow it to go on record? What is this? ... (*Interruptions*) ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Please sit down.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Sir, I seek your protection; I do not want to be interrupted.

SHRI K. G. MAHESWARAPPA: Your own Minister is interrupting you. You have got such Ministers in the Cabinet.

AN HON. MEMBER: All ** . (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Mr. Vice-Chairman, on a point of order. Apart from the fact that language in Parliament has to be temperate—on both sides; I am not referring to anyone—in this particular case a relevant point of order is: Can a Member of the other House in any way be described with abusive epithets of this kind? It is highly improper and, therefore, at least so far as the other House is concerned, we should be very scrupulous in seeing that no reference is made to any particular Member. ... (*Interruptions*)... Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am on a limited point, and that limited point is that Mr. V. P. Singh is today an honourable Member of the other House. Let not any of us

**Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

make any abusive references to an honourable Member of the other House. It is totally opposed to all parliamentary practice. I would request you to expunge those remarks. ...(*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Mr. Minister, I actually agree with Mr. Advani—a Member of the other House should not be accused. Here we are in a special situation where the entire discussion started on certain allegations of a particular Member. In spite of that, I request the Members of both the sides to use...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: Why are you allowing it? He has no right to use such words. That is the point for consideration...(*Interruptions*)... He has a right to allege but he has no right use that word. That is more important.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL (Punjab): And you have forgotten what Mr. V. P. Singh has said...(*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Please sit down.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: I won't use abusive epithets: I am only going to state facts. ...(*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): When a point of order is raised, it is between the Chair and the Member...(*Interruptions*). Please allow me to complete. When the discussion itself has started on a special circumstance, on the statements made by a certain Member of the other House, naturally his name will be picked up referred to and his references also will be quoted, as also his earlier references. But I request the Members on both sides to be temperate in their words...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Are you expunging that word?

SHRI RAM AWADHESH SINGH: Then should we call Rajiv Gandhi a**...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: You please tell us whether you have allowed the word or not. That is the point.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Mr. Aladi you can't force the Chair like this, please.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM): I am not forcing. I would only like to know...(*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Please sit down. You please allow me to speak.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): The point is whether the words used will be kept on record or expunged...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI RAM AWADHESH SINGH: All right, let it be there: there is no harm. We will call Rajiv Gandhi and everybody** ...(*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Mr. Ram Awadhesh Singh, one minute you stand up and say, it should not be there. Another minute you stand up and say, let it be there.

SHRI RAM AWADHESH SINGH: You are not giving the correct thing.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): I am going to give but you won't wait till then. I will look into the record and if there are objectionable words, I will remove them from the record.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): Still you are vague.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): I should know what has gone into the record. Yes, Mrs. Natarajan. Please continue.

**Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Sir, I am on a very limited point, and that is the only point I wish to make. I may respectfully take from what you already said just now. The entire allegations and the entire debate that is taking place in the House are made on the basis of allegations made by a certain person, a former Finance Minister who was formerly an hon. Member of this House. So also we thought. Sir, this is the person, as I was saying, who was originally in such a high position as the Chief Minister, who then became a Member of Parliament in 1971, who became a Minister in 1975, and I am saying that after becoming a Minister in 1975 amassed huge properties in Delhi.

SHRI RAM AWADHESH SINGH: Have you any proof? ...(*Interruptions*).

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: You deny it. I am saying it. Let me take the consequences of my statement.

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO (Andhra Pradesh): Counter-charges are not answer to the debate.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Let then say. My argument....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): She is not answering. The Government will answer finally.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Why should I answer? It is for me to say what I think about these charges. They are extremely relevant because we are now looking at the person who has made charges and the reason why he has made them and how far these charges can be proved I am sorry, I am referring to nobody. If a mad man goes on the street and screams charges nobody is going to take them seriously. If a great man gets up and makes these charges, every body is going to take him seriously. If a person whom we can prove is a chronic liar and is a person who always misused his authority, is a person who runs away at the first sign of trouble, is a person who has insatiable lust for power, and in the quest of that lust for power can make any kind of allegations... (*Interruptions*)

Sir, if I can prove that there is a person who has insatiable lust for power and in this lust for power has lost all sense of decency and morality then, Sir, I can show that no statement this person makes can possibly be taken seriously by anybody to be debated on the floor of the House.

Then, I just want to make the last submission, Sir. This was the person who was the Finance Minister of India. This was the person who has signed every page of that file. This was the person whose son one month after joining a foreign company in New York bought huge shares of Reliance stock and gave a wrong address as being in London. This is the person who has now started a new—I do not know whether it is a party or whether it is a movement or whether it is a people's movement. This is the person who should look around at his own colleagues. His own relative stands chargesheeted of murder in a horrible scandal. He should look at all the other people who surround him in his party.

Then Sir, I appeal to my colleagues here on the other side of the House, who have taken up the cause of Mr. V.P. Singh to clean up their houses first. We have the Bengal Lamp scandal in Calcutta. We have the Rama Rao Karshaka parishad scandal in Andhra Pradesh.

These are the people who are talking about probity in public life; what are we wasting the time of this House for? Let us talk about more serious issues.

Therefore, I say, Sir, that the whole idea, this entire debate has originated with only one idea, and that idea is to gain cheap political mileage out of vitriolic personal attack. It has no basis whatever. Mr. V. P. Singh himself has not been able to authenticate it.

I say, Sir, there is an end to the debate. Even earlier if my colleagues on the other side had any intention of getting at the truth, they should have joined the parliamentary Committee at that time. Now it

dose not lie in their mouth to demand another joint Parliamentary Committee.

It is just for cheap political advantage, and we should not waste the time of the House any longer.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, it is never easy to follow in the wake of the eloquence my charming colleague Smt. Jayanthi Natarajan. She has made my task particularly difficult today, because firstly, she started by terming today's debate as the most shameful in the history of our Parliament. Even at the mildest I would be constrained to observe that that is an uncharacteristically shrill and overstated observation coming as it does from a Member whose interventions we always look forward to. It is also difficult for me to follow in her wake because she confined herself to examining the personality of a certain Honourable Member of Parliament with whom, I do not suppose, we are centrally involved.

My disappointment is only on the ground that there are issues that this question of Bofors payments has raised; and if we continue to debate them, it is only because those issues have yet to be answered even satisfactorily, leave alone fully. The pricipal speaker from the treasury benches, hon. N. K. P. Salve, started by saying: "let the issue be resolved". It is an observation, and a sentiment with which I wholly concur. Let the issue of Bofors be finally resolved. We too are weary in our pursuit. We do not delight in this constant exchange of invectives with each other. We also believe that the nation has paid a very high price for Bofors and that price is not to be measured and connot be measured only in terms of dollars or setrilg or Swedish kroner. This is an assertion made by a number of speakers from the treasury benches that this debate has arisen only because of what a certain Honourable Member of Parliament, belonging to the other House has said. I submit that the only point from where this debate arises or where does the cerntral question lies. That central question, simply put, is that when it was stated that Bofors had made contract related payments, as 'commissions', to by now identified parties, of amounts which by now stand established, then how and with wha resoluteness of purpose did our Government clear the air and bring to book the accountable? That is the central question that remains; the question of accountability of the Executive to the Legislature. And unless that is resolved, I do put it across to all my colleagues, esteemed and otherwise, of the treasury benches that this will not go away.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: What is otherwise?

AN HON. MEMBER: You are not in that category.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: On an earlier occasion I had said that through a feat of an outstanding piece of journalism, the *Hindu* had published these documents. Shri N. K. P. Salve was good enough to describe the documents as 'stacks of papers', 'not worth the paper on which they are published' etc. Yet other quibbling legal points that he had made about validity of photo-copies etc. He being a Chartered Accountant of eminence, I can neither quibble with him on chartered accuontancy points, nor on the points about the figures that he gave, but I do submit that before this debate started today I had already submitted to the Chairman a set of 45 documents and I authenticate that set of 45 documents that I have submitted to the Chairman. I stand by those documents and I request that these documents be examined because the questions that these documents have raised are not questions relating to you or to me; they relate to the totality of the functioning of our nation, the totality of governance of moral authority as such. I repeat that, Sir, I have the same set of 45 documents here, which, I with due sense of responsibility as a member of this Parliament authenticate and lay on the Table of the House.

SHRI BAHARUL ISLAM (Assam): I am on a point of order. We do not disbelieve the honesty of the hon. Member. He is very honest. But he may be quite

[Shri Baharul Islam]

innocent of the legal provision. How can he authenticate some documents, the original of which is not in his custody? That is the point. Only an authority which is in custody of the original document can authenticate it. I cannot authenticate, he cannot authenticate. He may be very honest, but he cannot authenticate.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Suppose those who have got the original, if they give a certificate, what will happen then?

SHRI BAHARUL ISLAM: If these documents are the copies of those documents which are in possession of the Swiss Bank, only the authorities of the Swiss Bank can authenticate. Neither V. P. Singh, nor he, nor me can authenticate.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, here again with due respect to my esteemed colleague and a luminary of the Supreme Court, I am not on this small point of what precisely the legal meaning of the word "authenticate" is. I do repeat, I authenticate these documents as a Member of Parliament and I will lay them on the Table of the House.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: Mr. Jaswant Singh, under what rule you want to lay them on the Table of the House? (*Interruptions*). I do not know under what rule he wants to lay them on the Table of the House.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: He is interested to get at the truth. It is only to get at the truth, he is laying them on the Table of he House. If you are also interested to get at the truth, you peruse them.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: Mr. Dipen Ghosh, if he wants he can give it to the Chairman but he cannot lay it on the Table.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO (Jammu and Kashmir): I agree with the point made by my honourable justice sahib that he cannot lay these authenticated or original copies on the Table. The most important point on which I seek a ruling from you is that whether he can lay these documents on the Table.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): He cannot do it.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: My documents are authenticated. They are laid on the Table of the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): That cannot be done.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: The honourable, Mr. N. K. P. Salve, spoke about some "front companies" and "bazaar gossip". I will come to that subsequently, in a brief while. He also spoke about and that is a matter which was referred to by others as well, the defence of the country, choice of weapons and cancelation costs etc. He was good enough to point out that in one of the invoices what is mentioned is that the commission actually paid is for the L-70 ack-ack gun and not 155 mm Howitzer. Now that is very pertinent, because the invoice reveals more that what we had hoped. he invoice says it is not only in the case of 155 mm Howitzer that commissions have been paid agents were existing but also in the case of L-70 which has been in the use in the Indian Army, as an ack-ack gun, for long enough time; and for that too commissions have continued to be paid. It really does not solve the problem. In fact, it creates more problems.

Sir, we have moved a long way since the 17th April of 1987. Then, we were informed officially by the Government that the statement put out by the Swedish Radio was "false, misleading and mischievous" and that "nothing has been paid to the Swiss Bank". This was stated by the Prime Minister in an Army Commanders' Conference in the month of April, 1987. Again stated by the Prime Minister that it is "not commission when such payments are made. Again stated by the Prime Minister that it is "not paid to

an Indian" and finally, when doubts arose on that too that possibly it had been paid to an Indian, the Prime Minister said "it has not been paid to an Indian politician." From there we move to the recent Bangalore statement of the hon. Prime Minister. He says "We have never denied the payment of commissions". And the recent interview to a journal where the Prime Minister, indeed hypothetically, puts across a logic that if Bofors paid these sums, hypothetically speaking, as "industrial espoinage", then, they cannot be faulted on that account, there is nothing objectionable in that respect. This is a very depressing account of a befuddled and bedraggled Government engaging itself in some unworthy and unilluminating espionage of its own, an espionage of cover-up that has caused the misleading of the entire nation, misleading of both Houses of Parliament, of the Joint Parliamentary Committee, repeatedly and time and again. That is why this issue keeps coming up and until you solve it, it will keep on coming up.

The Prime Minister in the other House when Bofors had first surfaced, had said words to the effect that we don't need proof, give us evidence. In this House he had said "For heaven's sake, show us the direction in which we should look." When this direction is finally shown the hon. Prime Minister, the Treasury Benches and the Government do not only not look, they actually look away and when 5 00 P.M. we remind them to look in the direction in which the guilt lies. they turn on us and call us destablilizers. Sir, there are some overriding impressions and conclusions because of which Bofors haunts all of us. It is no longer a parochial problem. It does not delight us, because if you are diminished, the totality of Parliament is diminished—Then we too are diminished. If the moral authority of the entire system of governance is diminished, we are not going to get benefit out of it. What are the overriding impressions and conclusions? This is stated now through the land that this Government is not interested in establishing the truth in matters relating Bofors. Number 2: that this Government appears overanxious to protect Bofors S.A., M/s Win Chadha and the Hindujas. Number 3; that this Government drags its feet when presented with incontrovertible evidence as for example what the 'Hindu' did and those documents. Number 4; that this Government conducts itself as if it were being held to ransom by an armament dealer, a petty arms pedlar, Bofors S.A. Number 5; I implore the Government to examine these documents. I do not want to take the time of the House by quoting from there. A number of other speakers from the Treasury Benches and from this side have already done so. Three things have to be stated. Three identities stand established. Svenska, A&E Services, Moineau, Moresco or Pitco. Three code names that stand established are Lotus, Tulip and Mont Blanc. I submit to you that in the case of Tulip, there is indeed a note here which disturbs me and which makes me implore the Government to examine them and the note says, on the invoice of bank payment, "if it is possible, don't write who the payer is." This is a noting made on the invoice itself. In the light of all this, how could Mr. N. K. P. Salve have said that this is a bazar gossip, that this is not worth the paper on which it is published. That is what compelled me to authenticate it and lay it on the Table of the House.

Now I will conclude by asking five or six direct questions and then just one piece of advice to the Government. (*Interruption*). The Prime Minister, Sir, in the interview reported in this paper has said and hon. the leader of the House on an earlier ocacsion also referred to it and I am repeating what my leader in the House has also stated. The Prime Minister has said that "had we cancelled this, it would have resulted in a delay of one year and possibly, an additional cost of Rs. 1,000 crores." Sir, the question of cancellation of the contract with Bofors had a relevance and value at a certain point of time We cannot discuss this cancellation in abstract. When at this point of time, of the possibility of contract cancellation came up, it is my belief and I put it to you again with all sense of responsibility that the Army Headquarters,

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

in writing, communicated to the Prime Minister's Office that the consequences of the cancellation of Bofors contract would, at the most, result in a delay of six months and that we would not have to pay much extra money, leave alone one year and Rs. 1,000 crores that the Prime Minister is talking of. Therefore, I submit that if the Government really wants to establish its bona fides, let copies of that correspondence or advice given by the Army Headquarters to the Prime Minister's office be presented to Parliament. Let the Members have a chance to examine that for themselves. My second question is, did the Government, at any stage, question either M/s Win Chadha or Hindujas, after the revelation of the 'Hindu' documents, about aspects like Svenska? "Mr. Win Chadha, your name is being linked with Svenska, what do you have to say?" Was he charged with it? Was Hinduja asked, "Your name has been linked with Moresco, Moineau and Pitco. What do you have to say?" If they were not aksed, why were they not asked? And if they were asked, what has the Government found? I do not know whether Mr. Win Chadha is now in India. He has been permitted to leave the country. Is he in the country? In the duration for which he was in the country, he was charged with offences which had nothing to do with Bofors. And he has been permitted to leave the country without yet having been examined once by this Government on the question of Bofors. Unless you clarify these aspects, this debate will remain in and these points will keep on coming up. Fourthly, prior to the CBI team's visit to Sweden, was any formal request for co-operation from the investigative agencies of Sweden or from the Government of Sweden made by the Government of India? The next question is: Have you, till now, even till today, asked Bofors about these documents, which 'The Hindu' published and to which we are referring and which I have already submitted to the Chair? The next question is: Have you asked the Government of Sweden, even till today, for any kind of assistance...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Please, conclude now.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: ...in the investigation of Bofors? And Sir, my final question is: Why are you dragging your feet on the question of cooperation with the Government of Switzerland, the Federal Government of Switzerland?

SHRI TIRATH RAM AMLA (Jammu and Kashmir): He has repeatedly said that he had laid on the Table those verified documents. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: Already the Government has agreed to examine these documents. It is under investigation. What is wrong in submitting these documents? (*Interruptions*) The Member has a right to place it on the Table for additional information. (*Interruptions*) There may be some other document which you have not seen.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Mr. Aladi Aruna, you are going to speak. Why do you encroach upon others' time?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Now, I will conclude by asking the Prime Minister to do only that which he himself has publicly committed to do, about finding out the guilty and bringing them to book. I conclude, Sir, by appealing to the Prime Minister to do only that, to do it with recognisable despatch, to consult with us, to inform the Parliament about what is being done, to share with us, the Parliament, the difficulties that the Government is facing in going through this investigation, to convince us, Parliament, and the nation about its intents. Only that will clear the air, settle this debate and settle the issues. Sir, at the height of the Second World War, when Great Britain as a nation was under threat, Winston Churchill said of himself, and of the institution of Prime Minister, this and I repeat what he said because it has a relevance to our context and because I agree with that. He said, of himself and of the institution of Prime Minister, that if the

Prime Minister falters he must be supported. I agree. If he is mistaken he must be guided. I agree. When he sleeps his rest must not be unwisely disturbed. I agree. But if he fails to deliver the goods, he must be poleaxed. With that also I agree because if you do not deliver the goods, in this particular matter, not only will these issues keep on coming up but, certainly, in time, the people of India will poleaxe him. Thank you.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to briefly intervene in this debate on the core issues that have been confronting this issue right from the beginning and the manner in which (*Interruptions*). these issues are sought to be handled by my friends on the other side. What is this debate for in the ultimate analysis? We have debated this issue for quite a number of times in both the Houses. And I wish researches could go into how much time has been consumed and how much expenditure has been involved in the process and I am sure it is bound to be a larger amount than what my friends on the other side allege has passed in this deal. The session started on the 2nd. The newly formed party perhaps found that they did not have any issues. So it was thought that something should be spun. And what is it that has been spun? It is the statement which has made by the lead erof that party referring to the account number, the name of the account and saying that it pertains to the Prime Minister and that the amount has gone there. This, in my submission is the height of irresponsibility. I say irresponsibility because after two days the very stand was changed and it was said that what he had mentioned, the account, belongs to Svenska and that what has already appeared in *The Hindu* has been highlighted. This appeared long back, in April, and Government immediately took action to refer the matter to CBI about the authenticity of the documents and to pursue the same. Why this was done was to set the ball rolling. They thought since no issues were available and once Parliament assembled again afer the holidays there must be some fireworks, it is precisely with this in the background that this issue has been raised. It should not be forgotten and before I go further I would like to remind the nation that this gentleman is the same gentleman who had approved this deal as a Finance Minister; it is on record. And please do not forget that a man who can ascend through the ladder of this nation and kick off the ladder, will equally kick you all. Please beware! If this is the political morality for which you are pleading, by all means do so: but this type of political morality will cost the nation heavily. I would like to ask whether this type of debate which seeks really to discredit the democratic institutions of this country is worth pursuing, be it the Treasury Benches, be it the Opposition. I am grateful to Mr. Gurupadaswamy who raised an identical question. But he himself drifted. I would start by saying that the charge he made and equally made by one of my friends, Shri Dipen Ghosh, was that we are prevaricating and that there are inconsistent stands. I would like to submit that there are two parts of this issue. One part of the issue is whether the Government directly comes into the picture, the statement made by those concerned in the Government and the direct responsibilty that they have to assume for what they have said. The other aspect is the inforamtion or the stand based on that information which is not in your possession, but on which you have got to be guided by somebody else. So far as the first part is concerned, the Government's stand was very clear. We said that there should be no middle men and no amount should be paid to them, meaning thereby that the money should not influence the contract part of it. Now, on this part of it, the Government is wholly barred. There used to be middle men. It is a matter which is known not only in our country, but also internationally, that in the defence deals middle men are there and it is a matter of fact. The law, the Contract Law, validates it, it permits it, and legality is attached to the concept of commission and commission agents. It is not illegal. Now, what is it that this Government has done? This Government has said that there

[Shri P. Shiv Shanker]

should be no middle men and that they should not be paid and the contract should not be influenced in any form. Have we prevaricated from this stand? Has there been any evidence to show that the Government directly or indirectly had been a privy for purposes of having the middle men or to the money having been passed on to influence the contract? In fact, the story is otherwise. When I say that the story is otherwise, you can kindly look up and see that when the offer, the actual offer, was made by the company, the offer was made for Rs. 1,700 crores. I am not going into the nitty-gritty of the problem because I would only like to deal broadly with this issue. Now, what has happened? The Prime Minister of Sweden was categorically informed that there should be no middle men, that there shall be a direct negotiation with the governmental authorities for the purpose of sorting out this issue There was a Technical Committee for the purpose of going into the fact whether the gun is of the capability that we want. And, Sir, I must say that today there are two honourable Members on the Opposition side, who are sitting here now, who have paid compliments to the gun, and they have said that this is the best gun. I do not know whether it lies in the mouths of them to prevaricate at this stage and be inconsistent and just to denounce what they themselves have said publicly. That is a different issue altogether. But, on the question of the gun, . .

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Sir, will the honourable Minister yield for a minute? Sir, will the honourable Leader of the House yield for a minute?

I did certainly say and I continue to say that. But I think the two are totally unrelated aspects. One is about the quality of the gun and it is a high-quality gun and I continue to say that. Am I prevaricating on it? I am not prevaricating on it. But the aspect of commission paid on it and corruption attendant upon the deal remains.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I have not come to that; I have not come to that as yet.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA (Punjab): That is what I have also said. Probably you are now doubting that I am going to say something against the gun itself? That surprises me. I have said that these kickbacks are worse than the back blast. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I thought that they were going to join issue on the statement that I made. I am grateful to them they have supported my statement. (*Interruption*) I only said, Mr. Jaswant Singh, whether they would like to prevaricate. I never said that you have prevaricated. Please follow my language. You know better English than me. I thought I was trying to tell him in a very simple language.

Now, Sir, the point that I was trying to make, I was trying to deal with, was the question of stand that was taken by the Government. And the submission that I was making was that we wanted to eschew the middlemen. We wanted that money should not be paid to influence the contract in any form.

How do you judge this? How do you judge our conduct? Now, on the question that money should not be paid for the purpose of influencing the contract, in the facts and circumstances, how do you judge our conduct? Our conduct can only be judged on two accounts. One, whether the gun is of an inferior quality in any form. It is for that purpose I was trying to make the submission, that the two hon. Members sitting on the other side are on record that the gun is of the best quality. Apart from the fact that a committee of technicians have gone into it, which details have already been given by the JPC, I would not like to go into it, he detailed names have come Officers have come in. Unless one would like to say that all these officers are dishonest—that is a matter which I leave to the judgement and wisdom of my friends sitting on the other side. . . (*Interruptions*)

Now, one side dealt with the aspect of quality. The other aspect is whether money has been passed for the purpose of influencing the contract in any way. It is there where I was trying to say that the Prime Minister of Sweden was categorically informed that there should not be any middlemen taking money to influence the contract itself. We took all steps that were possible. And then there was the pricing committee, consisting of a bunch of officials, very highly placed, who have gone into the issue who bargained with the company, and have tried to see that the price is beaten down. In the ultimate analysis, the offer of Rs. 1700-crores has been brought down to Rs. 1400 crores or something, with the resultant effect of Rs. 300 crores advantage-unless you would like to go to the extent of saying that all these officers who were appointed on the pricing committee are the persons who should not be believed or if you would like to impute motives to them, which luckily so far nobody has alleged. If this be the position, I would like to ask you a question, where does the Government come into the picture on its own stand with reference to middlemen not being there, with reference to payments being made to them for the purpose of influencing the contract in any form? Where is the prevarication?

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA (Bihar): This is a new thing you are saying. You are saying that there should not be any middlemen. *(Interruptions)* Now, you are again shifting.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I started by saying, meaning thereby...

(Interruptions)

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: You are again shifting.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE (West Bengal): The argument of middlemen influencing the contract was not there earlier. Now the Leader of the House has brought in that notion of the middlemen influencing the contract.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: I may be permitted to say something on it. I maintain that it is a very good gun. He said that he wanted to ask a question. I have stood up because the Leader of the House said that he wanted to ask a question to which I would like to respond. That is all. Eventually, we had two guns.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I have never put a question to you.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: If you permit, I will speak. Otherwise, I will sit down.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: If you like to say something, I will yield. But I have never put any question to you. That is my submission. If you like to say something, I will yield.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: Thank you, very much. The point is whether the decision could be influenced. There were two guns which were equally good. One was the French and the other one was the Bofor's. I am repeating the statement made by the Chief of Army Staff who has now left. He said... *(Interruptions)*. He said that in his briefing to us when we went to Army Headquarter. I am only repeating that. In his briefing to the parliamentary party who went there, he said that. Therefore, to decide who is going to get the contract, influence could still be used. I am only answering the point whether influence could be used or not.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I have not been able to make head or tail of what he has said. I have made a reference to the hon. Member only on the question of quality. I would like to proceed ahead. The submission that I was making was that we, on our part, were categorical that there should be no middlemen. There is not an iota of evidence to suggest that the Government in any form, directly or indirectly, has engaged middlemen. As I submitted at the very outset, I have added that aspect of influencing the contract because the middlemen normally are meant for the purposes of directly or indirectly influencing the contract. That is one aspect of it. The other aspect of it is the middlemen getting money after the supplies under the contract have been effected. That is wholly a different issue altogether.

[Shri P. Shiv Shanker]

Therefore, when we were trying to say that there should be no middlemen, our approach was that the Government should get this gun at the cheapest rate possible and this is precisely the objective that we have achieved. (*Interruptions*)

राम अवधेश सिंह जी आपकी इंटेलीजेंसी बड़ी पक्की है। आप अगर इंटेलीजेंस में घुस जाय तो आप वहां बड़ा अच्छा काम करेंगे ।

Therefore, the point that I was trying to make was that the aspect where the Government comes into the picture and where the Government could be squarely accused, were these two issues about which the position stands absolutely clear. There is no prevarication whatsoever so far as the Government is concerned. Our stand remains. Throughout we have taken this stand and we adhere to it.

The friends have gone to the extent of saying that look in April 1987 you have said that nobody is involved. Then you have talked about winding-up charges. Then, of course, now the allegation is made about commission. I would like to make a clear statement on this aspect as well. What is it that you are charging the Government with today? You are charging the Government today of inconsistencies.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Suppressing the truth.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Well, is there any basis for suppression? I would very much appreciate if you bring any evidence to show that there is a suppression. By these facts, if you want to come to the conclusion that there is suppression, then I am sorry, you are too poor a rationalist to come to that conclusion.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: There is your own statement.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: What I am trying to say is this that the Government has not hidden anything in this case. You kindly see the debates. Documents have been filed which have come from the Bofors, and the reports that were furnished based on what Mr. Ringberg had gone into. In fact if you kindly recall, immediately in June, 1987, when we had received the report, the Prime Minister called the Leaders of the Opposition, and the copies of the report were made available to all of you on that occasion. I was there in the CCPA at that time when these copies were supplied. Copies of the documents from time to time which have come to our notice have been placed on the Tables of both the Houses. Now you please tell me. I ask you a question. In a matter which is not within my knowledge, suppose you accuse me that I am a thief, and suppose you say that I have committed theft at such and such house, now somebody has got to get this information. Government has to necessarily ask the Bofors. Immediately after there was a flash in the radio about this news, the Government contacted the Bofors. It was not the fabrication or the creation of the news by the Government when the Government said that no Indian is involved, no commission has been paid. It is because the Bofors Company said, this, which are the parts of the record in the House and in the other House, and in the documents.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: They said at your instance.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I would very much love if that is the perversity to which you would like to go, if you can prove that it is at our instance... (*Interruption*) I accuse you of the perversity of expression, nothing else. No realistic person can come to this conclusion at all.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: You briefed them for three days.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: If the conclusions have to be drawn on perversities, this is precisely the question that I have raised: Are we doing service to the democratic institutions in this country? If we have to demolish them, fair enough. That is totally a different issue altogether. But what I am trying to say is this that it is the Bofors which supplied the information. When the Bofors have supplied the details that these are the winding up charges, we have not withheld, we have placed

it on the Table of the House. You are attributing that these are the stands of ours. It cannot be. This information is not within our knowledge. Our stand was absolutely clear. We said that there should be no middlemen, that no amount should be stand. Now it transpires that the party, the party from whom one has to get the information, we got the information, we passed it on We were honest enough, we were honest enough to supply to the nation and the House the information that came to us. We did not spin it in any other form. We thought it is better that information must be shared with the nation. Now, your accusation that this is a prevarication does not fit into the texture at all. It is not our prevarication. It is a different thing as to what you are saying today or what you had been asking. You are saying that you blacklist, you call for the money or take action against this Company. It is a wholly different aspect altogether. I am not going into it. I am on a simple point. I am not standing here for the purpose of scoring a debating point. I would like that we should at least have some respect for the grain of truth. Now we have placed all the documents before the House and we have been trying to explain and I would like to tell you that according to me, I have said even earlier, that if we assume that what has appeared in the Hindu, the documents that have come, if they are assumed to be true and authentic, then they indicate that the commission has been paid and you would say again, look, this is again another prevarication. The prevarication is where I have to take a stand on the basis of facts that are in my possession, and if I am changing my stand that is understandable. But where one has to rely wholly on somebody else and has got to get the information and on the basis of that information you act...(*Interruptions*).

I would like to tell you one thing. You kindly go into the cases.

जांच की बात जो आप कह रहे हैं, इस देश में सुबह से शाम तक गरीब तक गरीब लोगों की मौत होती है मार दिये जाते हैं उनके कितने केसेज कोर्ट में सक्सेसफुल होते हैं। आप जांच की बात करते हैं... (व्यवधान) आप जांच की बात कर रहे हैं इस वास्ते ही मैं आपसे कह रहा हूं कि लोग जानते हैं कि मर्डर हुआ और आप जैसे हम जैसे ही ये लोग हैं जो देखने के बावजूद भी मुंह मोड़ लेते हैं। हम बोलते हैं कि भाई अदालत के चक्कर कहां से लगाएंगे और पुलिस वाला 25 मरतबे फिर आयेगा। यह हमारी रिस्पांसिबिलिटी है।... (व्यवधान) मैंने तो एक छोटी सी मिसाल आपको दी है... (व्यवधान) मैं आ रहा हूं... (व्यवधान) इन्होंने जो बात की है मैं उसका जवाब दे रहा हूं। मैं आपकी बात पर नहीं आया हूं।... (व्यवधान)

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : जांच की जवाब देही तो आप पर की है।

श्री पी० शिव शंकर : जब यह मालूम हुआ कि "हिन्दु" अखबार से कुछ कागजात की छपाई हुई है...

In fact I would like to go to the extent of congratulating that lady, Chitra Subramaniam, who has really brought out something.

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : "हिन्दु" पर केस कर दीजिए कि झूठा छापा है।

श्री पी. शिवशंकर : मैं एक तरफ उसकी तारीफ कर रहा हूं और आप कहते हैं दावा करो। आपका दिमाग भी अजीब है... (व्यवधान) अगर ये डाक्यूमेंट सच हैं तो उनकी बधाई देनी चाहिए।

Therefore that matter is under investigation.

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : आप सच तो नहीं मानते हैं।

श्री पी. शिवशंकर : अगर आप मुझे नहीं बोलने देना चाहते हैं तो और बात है। आप अपनी आदत से मजबूर है मैं क्या करूं। आप अपनी आंखों पर पट्टी बांधकर रखे हुए है। आप देखना ही नहीं चाहते हैं तो अब हम क्या दिखाएंगे आपको कोई भी नहीं दिखा सकता है भगवान भी नहीं दिखा सकता है आपको।

Now, the submissions that I was making was that these documents have been fabricated. Therefore the submission that I would like to make is that it is not a case

[Shri P. Shiv Shanker]

of inconsistency which is being charged by the other side. It is a matter which is not in our possession and you have to receive it from somebody else and every time a debate goes on and naturally whatever is available by then has got to be placed before the House. You have got to take your stand based on the information that has come to you and if you say that this is prevarication, I am sorry for the poor legal acumen or the poor rational approach that you have in the matter. Therefore in my submissions such a question does not arise in any form. I have already said, even previously I said that it appears to be very difficult to cancel the contract at this stage. I have said it on more than one occasion. Of course for the question that has been raised by the hon. Member, Shri Jaswant Singh, about the writing of the Army Headquarters to the Ministry, I must say that I congratulate him for his resourcefulness of the information, because these people have more intelligence than us, because being a Minister of the Cabinet I am absolutely not aware, but he seems to be aware more than me. I congratulate him for the efforts that he has put in, but this is a matter which the Defence Minister will reply. But I have been saying time and again and I have given the details in every debate and I would not like to go into it again as to the immense harm that would be caused if you annul the contract. The amounts I have given about Rs. 800 to 900 crores, and the damage that you will suffer will be the setback to the defence preparedness which will be relegated to the background for quite some time. And meanwhile, supposing something unfortunate happens, we will have to suffer the consequences. Apart from this, as I said, if you would like to go into other causes of it. I do not know whether in our place you would have taken a decision to blacklist them. Once it is proved that this is the best gun from the quality point of view, and there is a clause for the purpose of manufacturing that gun here, and there is also a clause for the purpose of transfer of technology for the purpose of manufacture of that gun, keeping that in view, whether you would like to blacklist them is a question on facts which you have to weigh and decide. If you have to take the decision to blacklist them, you must forgo this advantage. Now, whether the nation should forgo this advantage, is a matter which we have to decide based on facts. Prime Minister has said that the option of recalling money is still open. But that is a different matter which is still open, and I do not go into that. The point is, we seem to be groping in the dark. We seem to be only guided by a certain approach. Political approach for the purpose of creating a psychology is perfectly all right; but there should be a limit to it. If you would like to transgress the limit and would like to destroy the institutions which have been so assiduously built up at great cost, by a tremendous secrifice by the nation, that is entirely a different approach altogeher and I leave it to you.

I thought, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I should just intervene for the purpose of making the position clear and I thank the hon. Members for having given me this opportunity and listening to me at least with silence. Thank you.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: But truth has been silenced by you.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: Muzzled.

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : (बिहार): उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, अभी जब माननीय सदन के नेता श्री पी० शिवशंकर जी बोल रहे थे तो मुझ लग रहा था शुरू में कि इनके अंदर का जज बोलेगा क्योंकि यह जज और वकील दोनों रह चुके हैं पहले वकील इसके बाद जज। शुरू में लगा था कि शायद इनके अंदर का जज बोलेगा लेकिन जज दब गया और वकील बोलने लगा क्योंकि जिस तरह से अपनी बहस बीच में इंटरवीन करके इन्होंने शुरू की और जो बात गलत साबित हो चुकी है उसकी भी वकील की तरह से, वकील की भाषा में सही साबित करने की बहुत असफल चेष्टा की है।

माननीय इसमें कोई शक नहीं है। कि जब से स्वीडिश रेडियो ने बोफोर्स

कांड के बारे में दुनिया को बताया, उसके बाद से लगातार सरकार के स्टैंड में परिवर्तन और इसके सबूत सारे रेकार्ड पर हैं। मैं उनको दोहराना नहीं चाहता हूं। लेकिन रेफरेंस के लिए मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि शुरू से लेकर अभी तक कई बातें कही गई। स्वीडिश रेडियो के बाद कहा गया कि बिलकुल गलतबयानी है, सरकार को डिस्टैबिलाईज करने के लिए यह सारी बातें कही गई हैं। फिर कहा गया कि मिडलमैन नहीं था, फिर कहा गया कि बाइंडिंग-अप चार्जेज हैं, फिर कहा गया कि कोई राजनीतिक आदमी उसमें नहीं था, फिर यहां तक कि आकर प्रधान मंत्री को कहना पड़ा कि उसमें मेरा कोई हिस्सा नहीं हैं और मेरे परिवार के किसी आदमी का हाथ नहीं हैं।

यह तो किसी राष्ट्र के प्रधान मंत्री के लिए सब से छोटी बात हो सकती है और शर्म की बात हो सकती है कि प्रधान मंत्री को सदन में सफाई देनी पड़े कि मेरा और मेरे परिवार का इसमें कोई हाथ नहीं है। इसका मतलब कि सरकार की सारी जवाबदेही से बच कर केवल अपने परिवार को अपने कांडों से बचाना चाहते हैं, जबकि सरकार का दायित्व ऐसा जम्हूरियत में खास कर संसदीय प्रणाली में होता है, खास कर प्रधान मंत्री का कि उसकी कैबिनेट की उसकी मंत्रिपरिषद की या उस की सरकार के किसी अंग की कोई गलती हो तो उसकी जिम्मेदारी प्रधान मंत्री की मानी जाती है। वह प्रधान मंत्री सिमटते-सिमटते आकर अपने परिवार तक सिमट जाए, अपने तक सिमट जाए तो यह एक बहुत ओछी बात है और यह कोई बड़ी बात नहीं हो सकती। मान्यवर, मैं इस पर ज्यादा नहीं जाना चाहता हूं केवल इस बहस को सीमित रखते हुए, क्योंकि सारी बातें कही जा चुकी हैं अब उनको दोहराने से कोई लाभ नहीं है, इसलिए मैं केवल इतनी बात कहना चाहता हूं कि विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह ने जो डाकूमेंट जारी किया और उन्होंने फिर यह भी कहा कि "हिन्दू" में जो छपा है उसी को हमने कहा है इसको भी मान लीजिए तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि संयक्त संसदीय समिति की जांच के बाद यह जो डाकूमेंट "हिन्दू" में प्रकाशित हुए और यह मांग की गई कि इस की जांच कर ली जाए फिर संयुक्त संसदीय समिति से अगर सरकार का हाथ साफ होता, सरकार का चेहरा साफ होता तो जैसे एक संसदीय समिति से जांच करा ली और अब नया डाकूमेंट आ गया और जिससे आपकी ईमानदारी पर प्रश्नवाचक चिन्ह लग गया तो उस प्रश्नवाचक चिन्ह को हटाने के लिए आपकी जिम्मेदारी थी कि उसकी भी आप जांच करा लेते। परन्तु आज भी कुछ बिगड़ा नहीं है, इतना ही वी०पी०सिंह का कहना है कि हमने जो दस्तावेज जारी किया है एक संयुक्त संसदीय समिति में क्या आप उसकी जांच कराने को तैयार है, इस पर सरकार क्यों भागती है? अगर सरकार सही है और अपने बचाव के सारे तर्क देती है, हम उस तर्क को थोड़े समय के लिए, बहस के लिए मान लेते हैं, लेकिन मैं थोड़ा सा, एक वाक्य का तर्क यह रखना चाहता हूं कि जब इस डाकूमेंट को आप गलत मानते हैं, इसको आप समझते है कि यह डाकूमेंट विश्वसनीय नहीं है, लेकिन मैं कहता हूं कि इसी डाकूमेंट के आधार पर आप हिन्दुस्तान की जनता की अदालत में अविश्वसनीय हो गए हैं तो इस अविश्वसनीय डाकूमेंट की जांच के जरिए आप इस डाकूमेंट को अविश्वसनीय क्यों नहीं साबित कर देते? अगर आप का दामन साफ और पाक है तो इन दस्तावेजों की आप जांच करा लीजिए, इतनी ही तो मांग है, इस से अधिक तो मांग नहीं है।

मान्यवर, मैं दूसरी बात कहना चाहता हूं यह "संडे" की रिपोर्ट के बारे में और इधर से जो बात कही गई है अधूरी कही गई है, इसलिए इस में दो-तीन वाक्य मैं पढ़ूंगा और क्वश्चन समेत पढ़ूंगा। इधर से जो साथियों ने पढ़ा है, उन्होंने केवल उत्तर पढ़ा है। क्वश्चन का क्या रेलेवेंस है उस को मैं पढ़ना चाहता हूं।

क्वेश्चन था :

"We are not questioning the selection of the equipment."

[श्री राम अवधेश सिंह]

इन्होंने कहा कि, प्रधान मंत्री ने कि हमारी सैक्योरिटी के ख्याल से अच्छा वैपनज है, बढ़िया है, इसलिए हमने खरीदा, तो उसके जवाब में क्वश्चन किया :

"The question is whether or not money was taken."

क्वेश्चन यह है कि,

The question is whether or not money was taken. Even for an ideal choice, say, a mercedes benz car, there could be considerations. The question is whether a commission was taken....

The Prime Minister's reply was:

"we paid.."

That means, commission was paid. He says:

"Obviously, how many million Kroner-319 was the original number I think it ended up in 60 someting crores, 66 crores."

This was the reply of the Prime Minister. The interviewer pointed out that it was Rs. 64 crores. The Prime Minister said:

"Whatever it was. Anyway, that much money was paid to somebody. That is clear. Nobody doubts that. Nobody argues about that. We do not question that."

"यह प्रधानमंत्री का जवाब है। आगे फिर क्वेश्चन है --

"But to whom. Who got the money"

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री हैच० हनुमनतप्पा) : सारा का सारा पढ़ने की जरूरत नहीं है। आपका टाइम चला जाएगा।

SHRI RAM AWADHESH SINGH: The question is to whom and for what.

एक और पढ़ देता हूं। इसी में सारी बात आ जाती है।

"If it was paid for some genuine work that was done for Bofors, then we cannot question it." Then, "No, not genuine. Your deal with Bofors made it quite clear that there would be no middlement. So, there could be no genuine work, they were paid for.

यह क्वेश्चन का जवाब है --

"No, not genuine work in terms of middlemen Genuine work gathering information against the French weapon, for example. That is industrial espionage. You cannot grudge them, that you cannot."

मान्यवर, इन बातों से यह बात स्पष्ट है कि प्रधानमंत्री ने स्वीकार कर लिया कि यह कमीशन दिया गया और कमीशन देने के लिए वे यह कहते है कि जेनुइन काम के लिए, सही काम के लिए दिया गया। "सही काम" की परिभाषा क्या देते है कि इंफोरमेशन गेदर करने के लिए। इंफोरमेशन कैसे गेदर होती है? डील जब करते हैं आप दूसरी कंपनी से, दूसरे देश से तो उसमे क्या इंफोरमेशन गेदर करेंगे ...(**समय की घंटी**) .....इंफोरमेशन गेदर करना कि कंपरेटिव स्टडी दे सकते हैं, जैसे फ्रैंच से भी हमारी गन खरीदी जाने वाली थीं, उनमें कौन अच्छी है। तो इस बात के लिए कमीशन क्यों देगा? बोफोर्स कमीशन क्यों देगा यह बात साधारण समझ की बात है, जो प्रधानमंत्री ने कहा कि कंपरेटिव इंफोरमेशन देने के लिए, एज फोर एग्जाम्पल फ्रेंच गन, तो फ्रेंच गन और स्वीडिश गन में कौन बेटर है, क्या टेक्नीकल्टी है? इसकी इंफोरमेशन देने के लिए कौन कंपनी किसी को 64 करोड़ का कमीशन देगी, दलाली देगी? यह बात साधारण समझ की बात है।

मान्यवर, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं ...(**समय की घंटी**)... अंत में ही थोड़ी और बात है। मान्यवर, मैं यह कह रहा था कि जब प्रधानमंत्री ने यह स्वीकार कर लिया और जब मैंने यह अखबार में पढ़ा तो मुझे एक कहावत याद आ गई—सैंध पर विरह का गाना गाना। इसी प्रकार प्रधानमंत्री का यह बयान है।

सेंध पर विरह का गाना गाना, शायद आप लोग जानते होंगे, यानी चोरी और सीना जोरी, दोनों एक साथ। जब कोई चोरी करने गया, सेंध पर ही वह विरह का गाना गाने लगा कि हम चोरी कर रहे हैं। इसी प्रकार का यह बयान है, पहले तो कहा हमारा कोई रिश्ता नहीं है, कोई मिडिल मैन नहीं है और अगर होगा तो उसे दंड दिया जायगा। अब यह स्वीकार किया है कि जेनुइन वर्क के लिए तो हमने दिया है, यह कोई बुरी बात नहीं है। अभी यहां फ्लोर पर भी लीडर आफ दी हाऊस माननीय शिवशंकर जी ने कहा कि यह लीगल है कमीशन देना, कोई गलत काम नहीं है। यह बात इन्होंने यहां स्वीकार की। आपने यह पहले क्यों नहीं कहा ? आप पहले कह देते तो बात खतम हो जाती, इतना झमेला क्यों होता। आज जो आप कह रहे हैं—कमीशन दिए है और इंफारमेशन गेदर करने के लिए दिए हैं। यही बात आप शुरू में कह देते कि दिया है कमीशन, हमारे परिवार के लोगों ने नहीं लिया है, यह लीगल है, उचित है, इटरनेशनल कांटेक्ट में होता है। उस दिन तो आप साधु बनने लगे कि हम कुछ नहीं लेते, कुछ नहीं जानते। लेकिन अब आप घिर चके है, सारे दस्तावेज आ गए है, प्रधानमंत्री घिर गए हैं, इनका दामन पाक-साफ नहीं है। दामन पर कालिख लग चुकी है और मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि आप चाहे जितनी सफाई देते रहे और बहुमत के बल पर हमारी कमजोर आवाज को दबा लें, लेकिन सड़क पर, खेत-खलिहान में—चारों तरफ लोग कहते हैं कि बोफोर्स में बहुत दलाली ली गयी है और कोई थोड़ा भी गड़बड़ आदमी दिखता है जोकि गड़बड़ी करता है तो रिक्शे वाला भी कहता है कि इसमें कुछ बोफोर्स मालूम होता है। मतलब इसमें कुछ गड़बड़ है, दलाली है। यह बोफोर्स तो आज एक तरह से विश्लेषण के रूप में जनता यूज करती है। आप जनता के कठघरे में हैं, इसलिए आप एक काम कीजिए कि जो डाकूमेंट रिलीज किया गया है उसके लिए एक संयुक्त संसदीय समिति की जांच बिठाइए, नयी कमेटी गठित कीजिए और पंद्रह दिन या एक महीने के अंदर केवल इस डाकूमेंट्स को आप जांच करके साफ कर दीजिए तो आपके चेहरे पर जो दाग है वह साफ हो जाएगा। आप अगर नयी कमेटी नहीं बिठाओगे तो दाग साफ नहीं होगा। आप जनता की नजर में कसूरवार हैं और कुसूरवार रहेंगे। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त करता हूं।

श्री पशुपति नाथ सुकूल (उत्तर प्रदेश): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं 12 बजे से ही सभी लोगों के और विशेषरूप से अपने विरोधी साथियों के भाषण सुन रहा हूं। अभी मैंने श्री राम अवधेश जी का भाषण सुना। यह बड़ी विचित्र और बड़ी दुखद स्थिति है जिसमें यह बहस हो रही है। हमारे भूतपूर्व वित्त मंत्री जी ने जो डाकुमेंट्स या जो पत्र जारी किए हैं, जैसाकि आपने कहा, वह वही है जो हिन्दू में छपे है कोई नया पत्र नहीं है और जो हिंदू में छपा था उस पर तो पावस सत्र में बहस हो चकी थी। उसके बाद कोई नयी चीज नही कही गयी है। सिर्फ एक पुरानी बात को बार-बार दोहराया जा रहा है जैसा कि हिटलर का गोबल्स था। बार-बार झूठ बोलकर उसको सत्य साबित करना चाहता था उसी तरह से राम अवधेश जी और उनके साथी उसको सत्य साबित करना चाहते है। हमारे विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह जी ने जो तीन डाकुमेंट्स जारी किए हैं और हिंदू में जो जारी किया गया है—उन दोनों के विवरणों को अगर आप मिलाइए तो आप देखेंगे कि वे बिल्कुल भिन्न हैं। कागजात वही हैं, दलील भिन्न है। क्या कहा है उन्होंने। उन्होंने पहली बात कही कि लोट्स के नाम स्विस बैंक कार्पोरेशन जेनेवा के खाता नंबर 99921 पीयू में कमीशन जमा किया और यह खाता राजीव का है और बाद में मुकर गए। हिंदू में भी यही नम्बर था लेकिन वहां पीयू की जगह टीयू था और उसमें था कि यह लोटस का नहीं स्वेंस्का का खाता है। लोटस नाम के खाते में भी कुछ जमा किए जाने की बात थी, लेकिन उसका कोई नम्बर

[श्री पशुपति नाथ सुकुल]

नहीं दिया गया था । परन्तु जल्दी में उसको पढ़कर हमारे विश्वनाथ बाबू जी ने पहले उस को लोटस का खाता बनाया, राजीव का खाता बनाया और उसमें जमा कराया । दूसरी बात उन्होंने कही, जैसाकि 5 नवम्बर के 'इंडियन एक्सप्रेस' में छपा था कि 19 दिसम्बर, 86 को बैंक से कहा गया कि जमा करने वाले का नाम न बताया जाए । हिन्दू में इस बात की भी चर्चा थी लेकिन वहां जो एकाऊंट था वह न लोटस का था, न स्वेस्का का था, वह एकाउंट था ट्यलिप । यह हिंदू में था । अब हिंदू सही कह रहा है या विश्वनाथ जी सही कह रहे हैं, इसे कौन तय करेगा ? हो सकता है विश्वनाथ जी ने कोई ऐसे कागजात देखे हों जो हिंदू के पास हों और हिंदू ने उनको नहीं छापा हो, उनको संसार नहीं जानता लेकिन वह जानते होंगे । तीसरी बात जो उन्होंने 6.00 P.M. कही, उन्होंने तीन राशियां बताई, इनवाइसिज के नम्बर बताए, धनराशि बताई कि यह रुपया कमीशन के रूप में दिया गया और उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, वह एवजर्ड है क्योंकि वह एक दूसरे कान्ट्रेक्ट के बारे में है । वह एक दूसरा कान्ट्रेक्ट भारत सरकार को सप्लाई करने के बारे में था । उस कान्ट्रेक्ट का नम्बर था 6(5)/84 डी/(जी०एस०)-4 । यह कान्ट्रेक्ट जो था यह एल-70 तोपों के साज समान को मुहैया कराने के बारे में था । तो जो टोटल अमाउंट सप्लाइज़ का था वह हमारे विश्वनाथ जी ने दे दिया है जब कि उस पर कमीशन पेयबल था वह उसके पहले की बात थी और वह जो कमीशन था, वह जो पहला उन्होंने अमाउंट बताया 47,29,190 स्विस क्रोनर का, उस पर 6 परसेंट का कमीशन था और बाकी के दो फिगर्स थे उस पर .96 परसेंट का कमीशन था । उन्होंने कमीशन का अमाउंट नहीं दिया है, उन्होंने टोटल कान्ट्रेक्ट का अमाउंट दे दिया है और कहा गया कि इतना कमीशन खाया, 32 मिलियन क्रोनर का कमीशन खाया गया है । तो जिस आदमी को यह ही नहीं पता कि डिटेल्ज़ क्या हैं, उस आदमी की बात के ऊपर क्या बहस की जाए उसका तो एक ही लक्ष्य है कि राजीव गांधी को हटाओ । उसने कभी राजीव गांधी के अलावा कोई और नाम लिया है ? राजीव गांधी को हटाया जाए, क्यों हटाया जाए, क्योंकि राजीव गांधी के हटने से कांग्रेस सरकार हटेगी । राजीव गांधी के मायने हैं कांग्रेस सरकार, और क्यों हटाया जाए क्योंकि प्रधान मंत्री पद के लिए रास्ता साफ हो जाए ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, सन् 1980 में हमारे यू० पी० के कांग्रेस विधान मण्डल दल ने संजय गांधी को अपना नेता सर्वसम्मति से चुना था कि मुख्य मंत्री बनायेंगे । संजय गांधी ने राजा साहब को नामिनेट किया कि मुख्य मंत्री यह बनेंगे, उनके कहने पर यह मुख्य मंत्री बने और जब डकैतों का मामला चला और 10-12 सौ यादवों की हत्या की गई तो उसके बाद वह छोड़कर चले गए । फिर मिसेज़ गांधी ने उनको मंत्री बनाया और राजीव गांधी ने तो उनको नम्बर दो बना दिया । राजीव गांधी तो उनके मित्र की तरह थे, बड़े भाई की तरह थे । तो मित्र के साथ धोखा करना, मित्र के साथ द्रोह करना और जिस फैमिली ने उनको बनाया, बजाए इसके कि उसके वह कृतज्ञ हों, वह कृतघ्नी साबित हुए और पूरे कैबिनेट के साथ, जिसके साथ उन्होंने काम किया, जो आज वह कहते है कि हमने यह फाइल देखी थी, वह फाइल देखी थी, पूरे मंत्री मण्डल के साथ आज वह विश्वासघात कर रहे है और अभी मुझे याद आया कि हमारे जो आदिपुरुष थे, दार्शनिक मनु, उनका एक श्लोक है इसी के ऊपर

"मित्रद्रोही कृतघ्नश्च: तथा विश्वास-घातका: (ब वधान)

मैं मनु का श्लोक सुना रहा हूं जो शाश्वत सत्य है

"मित्रद्रोही कृतघ्नश्च: तथा विश्वासघातक: तयस्ते नर्कयान्ति यावच्चन्द्र दिवाकरौ ।"

जब तक आसमान में सूरज और चान्द हैं, मित्र का द्रोही, कृतघ्नी और विश्वासघाती नरक में रहेगा । आज आप उनको मर के ऊपर बिठाए बैठे हैं जिस पार्टी ने उनको इतना दिया, जिन लोगों ने दिया, आज वह उनकी पीठ में छुरा घोंपकर बैठे हैं । आपके पास तो नेताओं का अकाल है । आपका कोई नेता नहीं था, किसी की क्रेडिबिलिटी नहीं थी, एक नया नेता आपको चाहिए था अपनी क्रैडिबिलिटी जमाने के लिए और आपको विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह में वह नेता मिल गया । सारे विपक्ष ने उठाकर उसे अपने सर पर बैठा लिया है और उसके पीछे-पीछे आप लग गए हैं ।

SHRI MOTURU HANMANTHA RAO: Just a question. Does he mean to say that all these documents which have been revealed to press now were kept as Cabinet secrets?

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: No, no. What I have said, you have not followed. I said that they were very old documents and that they were published in "THE HINDU". There is nothing new about them. (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. MANUMANTHAPPA): Don't convert it into a dialogue.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: You reconcile, they are the same documents as published in "THE HINDU" and as now released to the press by Mr. V. P. Singh.

मैं विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह जी के चरित्र पर प्रकाश डाल रहा था क्योंकि वे राजीव गांधी को *कहते है, *कहते हैं, उनको निकालो कहते हैं जो कि वह साबित नहीं कर पाए हैं, विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह जब तक कैबिनेट मिनिस्टर रहे 1980 के बाद, हर मंत्री जून के महीने में अपने ऐसेट्स की डिटेल देता है प्रधान मंत्री को, लेकिन उन्होंने एक भी नहीं दिया है ।

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

He did not give the annual details of his assets as necessary, as desired, to the Prime Minister.

बाकी सारे मंत्री देते हैं, लेकिन विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह ने सेंट्रल मिनिस्टर की हैसियत से नहीं दिया । मैं आग्रह करना चाहूंगा अपने गृह मंत्री जी से, डिफेंस मिनिस्टर साहब से कि वे इस बारे में पता लगाएं कि कितने ऐसे मंत्री हैं जिनको सालाना रिटर्न देनी चाहिए थी अपने ऐसेट्स के बारे में, उन्होंने नहीं दी, क्या विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह भी उनमें से एक है ?

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगत देसाई) पीठासीन हुये ।)

श्रीमन्, जैसा अभी हमारी बहन बोल रही थीं, जयन्ती जी कह रही थीं, उस पर आपने गौर नहीं किया । वह कह रही थीं कि सेंट्रल मिनिस्टर बनने से पहले दिल्ली में उनके पास क्या प्रापर्टी थी और मिनिस्टर बनने के दौरान कितने कामर्शियल कॉम्प्लेक्स, कितने अपार्टमेंट्स दिल्ली में उन्होंने ऐक्वायर किए । आप जानते हैं कि इनमें जितने ट्रांजेक्शंस होते हैं वे आधी कीमत के होते हैं और आधा पैसा ब्लैक में दिया जाता है इनकम टैक्स बचाने के लिए । दिल्ली में बाराखंभा रोड पर, कैलाश ऐपार्टमेंट में, नेहरू प्लेस में, महरौली में कितने ऐक्वायर किए ? कहां से आया वह पैसा ? इसीलिए उन्होंने अपने ऐसेट्स नहीं दिए, अगर ऐसेट्स दिए होते तो पता लग जाता कि कितने बढ़े हैं ... (व्यवधान)

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : क्या लिए है ? ... (व्यवधान)

श्री पशुपति नाथ सुकुल : अब तो वे आपके नेता है आप जानते हैं, मिश्र जी आपको मालूम नहीं है कि एक जमाने में उन्होंने अपनी जमीन जो ऊसर बंजर पड़ी थी भूदान में दे दी थी, सैकड़ों बीघा भूदान में दी थी और उसके बाद उनकी वाइफ ने कोर्ट में यह हलफनामा लगाया कि मेरा पति पागल है और पागलपन के कारण उसने यह जमीन दी

[श्री पशुपति नाथ सुकुल]

है दान में। आपको शायद मालूम नहीं है कि आगरा के पागलखाने में ये रखे गये यह प्रूव करने के लिये कि वे पागल हैं और वह जमीन वापस मिलनी चाहिये और वह जमीन उनको वापस दी गई। अब वे लीडर इनको मिल गए। इनके लीडर एन. टी. आर. हैं इनके लीडर चौटाला है* देवीलाल हैं वे कितने हैं? इनके लीडर रामकृष्ण हेगड़े हैं जिनके बारे में कोर्ट वर्डिक्ट आ चुकी है। एन. टी. आर. के बारे में कोर्ट वर्डिक्ट आ चुकी है लेकिन उनको नहीं हटाया गया है... (**व्यवधान**)

श्री बी० सत्यनारायण रेड्डी : क्या बात कर रहे हो तुम? इनकी जबान बंद कीजिये... (*Interruptions*)

श्री पशुपति नाथ सुकुल : जरा आप बैठिए। चौटाला का कैसा लेनदेन है?.. अभी ज्योति वसु के बारे में... (**व्यवधान**)

श्री बी० सत्यनारायण रेड्डी: जो समस्या है उसके बारे में कहो... (**व्यवधान**)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Please sit down.

श्री पशुपति नाथ सुकुल : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरी बात इन लोगों के चिल्लाने में चली गयी... (**व्यवधान**) तुम्हारा नेता* जो विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह को आप अपना नेता बनाकर बैठे हैं... (**व्यवधान**)* जनता दल चल रहा है, राम कृष्ण हेगड़े, देवी लाल जैसे * आदमी आपके नेता हैं।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Please don't mention the names of those who cannot defend themselves here.

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

श्री पशुपति नाथ सुकुल : यह तमाम अखबारों में पत्र-पत्रिकाओं में छपा है। ये झूठा आरोप लगा सकते हैं और हम क्या सही बात भी नहीं कह सकते। यह उस बात को सही नहीं कर सकते। मैंने आपको बताया कि विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह का चरित्र कैसा रहा है। मैंने आपको बताया कि उनकी बीवी ने कहा कि यह पागल है। इन्होंने भूदान में अपनी जमीन दे दी। उस जमीन को वापस लेने के लिये बीवी कहती है, एफिडेविट लगाती है कि यह पागल हैं। यह जाकर आगरे के पागलखाने में भी रहे हैं। दे गोट बैक द लैंड। आज 88 है सन् 86 में क्या हो रहा था.. (**व्यवधान**) जब वी. पी. सिंह यहां मंत्री थे तो पूरे एक सप्ताह उत्तर प्रदेश की असेम्बली नहीं चली। क्योंकि जनता दल, भारतीय जनता दल, लोक दल सब यह डिमांड कर रहे थे कि वी. पी. सिंह के खिलाफ इंक्वायरी बैठाई जाये, जांच कराई जाये राम जानकी ट्रस्ट, दहिया ट्रस्ट के बारे में। उस समय वीर बहादुर सिंह जी की सरकार थी। आज आप उसके चमचे बने हुये हैं (**व्यवधान**)। वह आपको ऐसी जगह ले जायेंगे जहां आपको पानी नहीं मिलेगा। (**व्यवधान**)

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO: It is shame that after all those crimes he was taken into the Central Cabinet:

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: Now you have formally taken him over.

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO: Who was responsible for that? So long as he was with you he was all right. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: We would have been happy if you had accepted the demand of the Janata Party, Lok Dal or BJP of UP to institute an investigation against Mr. V. P. Singh. But at that time you supported Mr. V. P. Singh. You refuted the charge of the Opposition and gave him the promotion to the post of Finance Minister.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: What about Jyoti Basu?

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Don't talk about him. Jyoti Basu does not require certificate or otherwise from you.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: He does not require.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: He does not require. You made Mr. V. P. Singh Defence Minister in spite of all those charges. You made him number two. We would have been happy if you had dismissed him, but you did not do that.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: Mr. Dipen Ghosh, when you were speaking I did not disturb you. I did not do that. I was simply listening to you. (Interruptions) जब वह मंत्री रहे तो उस अपने मंत्रित्व काल में.. (व्यवधान) How many commercial apartments did he acquire in Delhi? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Sir, we are not discussing Mr. V. P. Singh here. If you go through the Agenda, it says it is a brief discussion about the disclosures of payments.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: If it emanates from the statements of Mr. V. P. Singh references to him and his conduct will be made.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: It is about an ex-Minister, who does not file the annual returns of his assets. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, ...

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : एक मिनट ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश देसाई) : आप बैठ जाइये ।

Mr. Sukul, are you yielding?

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: I am not yielding.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): He is not yielding, please sit down.

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : एक मिनट ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN SHRI JAGESH DESAI): He has made it clear that he is not yielding.

श्री पशुपति नाथ सुकुल : मैं यह कह रहा हूं कि जसवंत सिंह जी ने दो बातें कहीं थी दो बातें आपने टच कही हैं । जहां तक मैं समझ पाया। पहली बात तो यह है कि उन्होंने हाउस को मिसलीड किया, गवर्नमेंट ने हाऊस को मिसलीड किया और दूसरी बात यह कही कि गिल्टी को पनिश नही किया । इनवेस्टीगेशन कम्पलीट नही हुआ है (व्यवधान) राजीव जी ने क्या कहा ? राजीव जी ने पहले तो अपनी सफाई दी क्योंकि उनके ऊपर चार्ज लगाया जा रहा था । उन्होंने हाऊस में कहा, वह रिकार्ड पर है, हमारा या हमारे परिवार का कोई आदमी इससे संबंधित नही है । दूसरी चीज यह कही कि कोई इण्डियन इससे संबंधित नहीं है । हमने इतना पता लगाया । अब कौन है यह पूरी छानबीन कर रहे हैं । जब कोई इण्डियन नही है और वह नहीं है और आप बार बार उन्ही के ऊपर इशारा कर रहे हैं और उनको लायर बता रहे हैं, झूठा बता रहे हैं, इस बात तरह से तो आप इस देश को रसातल में पहुंचा देंगे । इतना झूठ बोल कर थोड़े से राजनीतिक स्वार्थ के लिये आप देश के प्रधानमंत्री को जो प्रबल बहुमत से चुना हुआ है जिसको देश ने वहां पर बैठाया है आप छोटी छोटी बातों से आक्षेप लगा कर उनके ऊपर कीचड़ उछाल कर इस देश के लोकतंत्र के साथ, लोकतंत्र की जो संस्था है पार्लियामेंट इसके साथ अन्याय कर रहे हैं और स्वयं आप लोकतंत्र की जड़ खोद रहे हैं हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर (व्यवधान) इस पावन कार्य में आप लगे हुये हैं । जहां तक जांच करने और पनिश करने का सवाल है जिसकी बात आप कर रहे थे, यहां पर राजीव जी ने कहा हाईपोथेटिकली मान लें कि ऐसा हुआ और उसको आप सही मान रहे हैं (व्यवधान) जहां तक इनवेस्टीगेशन का सवाल है I quote:

"Now the investigation is still continuing. The questions....we approached the Swiss also. The CBI approached the the Swiss. We got two things going with the Swiss. We started talking to them on a treaty. I believe only one other

[श्री पशुपति नाथ सुकूल]

country has such a treaty with them-that's United States. And they agreed to have a treaty with us. The preliminary work is done. Now we are working on the treaty. The treaty is going to take a little while. The last time I asked, they said it will take about a year. But that was about four or five months ago. So, perhaps by the beginning of next year, by the spring of next year, we should be in a position to sign a treaty with the Swiss on the same lines that the Americans have. But there is a basic problem with the Swiss: they don't tell you anything unless there is an infringement of their laws."

When the Prime Minister was asked "And tax evasion isn't a crime there?" He said "No, it's very complicated. I wouldn't like to say a simple thing when the position is not. They say yes, when there is an income-tax violation. It is an offence but if this is the case it is not, if that is the case it is not...if that's the ...you know these are so many provisions and loopholes that it is difficult just quantify and say anything.

But we have taken it up with the Swiss. And we will continue to take it with the Swiss. We are really following it up now with the documents that were printed in the Hindu. In case something does come out...."

That investigation is on. The CBI is going through the probe. We are going to have treaty with the Swiss and with the Swiss people so that all the relevant details that are supposed to be are finally known to us and then, only we will be in a position to bring those facts before the people, before the public and before the Parliament of India.

इसीलिये मैं कह रहा हूं जब तक यह जांच पूरी नहीं हो जाती, उसका अपना एक तरीका है, दूसरा देश इनवाल्व है, उनके लाज इनवाल्व है, उनके सिक्रेट्स इनवाल्व हैं । जब तक यह जांच पूरी नहीं हो जाती और गिलटी का पता नहीं लग जाता तब तक इस तरह का अनर्गल प्रलाप न विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह को शोभा देता है और न आप सब को शोभा देता है । अगर आप इस चीज को बार-बार इसी तरह से करते हैं और बीच बीच में इस तरह से सरकार के ऊपर अटेक करते हैं... (व्यवधान)... अगर आपने ऐसा किया तो आप भारतीय लोकतंत्र के साथ अन्याय करेंगे और भारत की जनता के साथ अन्याय करेंगे । इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं ।

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am not willing to repeat what my hon. friends from this side expressed regarding Bofors deal. But I would like to reiterate the allegations preferred by them. The most important issues for the consideration of the House are, whether commission was paid by Bofors or not; who were the real recipients of commission; what are the services rendered by three agencies, Svenska, Moresco and A.E. services; whether defence of Bofors that it has paid up only winding up cost is acceptable; and whether there is involvement of our Prime Minister in this big scandal? Sir, right from the beginning, this Government, under the leadership of our Prime Minister, has been denying the charges by saying that there is no payment of commission, there are no middlemen and there is no involvement of our Prime Minister. Sir, on various occasions, our Prime Minister had assured the House that if there was any proof, he was prepared to take action. Sir, I would like to remind this House of various utterances of our Prime Minister on 20th April 1987 in Lok Sabha. With your permission, I would like to quote:

"You show us any evidence, we do not want proof. We will bring the proof. You show us any evidence that there has been involvement of the middlemen of pay-off or bribe or commission. We will take action. We will see that nobody however high-up, is allowed to go free."

Sir, our Prime Minister was very emotional and rhetoric on that occasion. Now, he is very reluctant to face the facts. Unfortunately, the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Bofors issue endorsed blindly all the stances taken by the Government and our Prime Minister. That is why, I say... (*Interruption*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): No, no. I do not think you should say like this.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: Why? I have every right to say.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): No, no. It is a representative Committee.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: What did I say?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): You said that the Joint Parliamentary Committee has taken whatever the Government wants to take.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: Yes, it has endorsed the stance taken by the Government. That is my view. What is unparliamentary or illogical in it? (*Interruption*)..

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): No, I cannot allow it.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Is it not a fact that the J.P.C. report had endorsed the Government view?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): No, no. It is an allegation against the Committee. The Government may be thinking on those lines. You cannot say like this. (*Interruption*)..

SHRI DARBARA SINGH: He might be a blind man in our Committee. But we were with open eyes.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: After the publication of the Joint Parliamentary Committee report on Bofors issue, so many authentic documents have been published by the 'Hindu' and other newspapers. Sir, now the defence preferred by the Government has collapsed like a house of cards. I would like to say that this is an information from authentic sources. Now, the Government is not in a position to dispute the veracity of the document published by the 'Hindu' and produced by hon. leader, Mr. V. P. Singh. Now, you have ordered for investigation to find out the veracity of the documents. Now, you raise certain doubts. You have every right to raise doubts. But, Sir, the document was published by 'The Hindu' on June 23rd, 26th or something like that. So far you have taken six months to find out or examine the veracity of the document. For the information of this House, I would like to say that at first, Bofors refused to disclose the names of the recipients. After great pressure, it came forward to disclose three names. The Prime Minister and the External Affairs Ministry were informed. Subsequently, the Joint Parliamentary Committee was informed. Sir, the Joint Parliamentary Committee, after receiving...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): You are reopening the whole history.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: Please let me say what I want to. (*Interruptions*). After receiving these three names, it asked the CBI to examine the nature and the functions of the three agents, Svenska, Moreso and A.E. Services. Sir, I am to inform this House that within two months the CBI submitted its report to the Joint Parliamentary Committee. But you have taken more than six months to examine the veracity of the document produced by "The Hindu". Why is there abnormal delay? The Defence Minister may please answer this question Then, Sir, we produced some documents. Mr. V. P. Singh has produced some documents and 'The Hindu' has produced some documents.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Mr. V. P. Singh's documents are quite different.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: Whatever it is. He has published. (*Interruptions*). My point is, you are disputing them. To establish that there was a commission, to establish that there was an agent, to establish that there was involvement of bigwigs, we produce these documents. Now, defence saying that there is no commission, there is only winding-up charge. I ask the Minister: Are you prepared to prove that there was only payment of winding-up costs by showing any draft or any cheque? Normally, only in trade, business, invoices are utilised. But for settling the account, we know well, the amount will be paid either by cheque or by draft. I am prepared to accept your argument. Let the Defence Minister or the Prime Minister produce the Zerox copy of the cheques or drafts given by Bofors to the various agents.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): How does the Government come into the picture?

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: You have accused. You have to produce the evidence.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Mr. Aladi Aruna... (*Interruption*)

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: When I am capable enough to produce something to establish may argument, claim, why can you not? You are having the machinery with you. Then, Sir, Mrs. Jayanthi Natarajan has told the House that Mr. V. P. Singh has signed in the document here and there. I am to remind the House that this Bofors contract was absolutely, exclusively, dealt with by the Defence Ministry under the chairmanship of the Defence Secretary, not by the Finance Ministry. The responsibility of the Finance Ministry is to see whether the contract has been reached within the allotted amount. It has no right to examine, it has no conventional practice to examine the merits of the system or the technical evaluation certificate. It is not the duty of the Finance Ministry. (*Interruptions*). If the Finance Ministry is not answerable, if there is any advantage or disadvantage or any merit or defect, the entire thing with go to the Defence Ministry.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: Even for a small quantity of foreign exchange, the Finance Ministry has to approve of it.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: The awarding of the contract is not the duty of the Finance Ministry. It is under the chairmanship of the Price Negotiating Committee under the chairmanship of the Defence Secretary. I would like to repeat, repeatedly the Government claims that because of the direct negotiation we are benefitted to the extent of Rs. 19.25 crores. This is a fraudulent claim. The Government conveniently preferred the date 10th February. What is the offer of Bofors? Tenth January. The offer of Bofors was Rs. 1,437 crores. If you calculate the offer of Bofors from January, you are benefited only by Rs. 10 crores, nothing more than that. Therefore, the claim of Rs. 192 crores is a fraud on the part of the Government. Right from the beginning our Government unfortunately supports the stance of Bofors. First no bribe, no commission. It was endorsed by the Government. Then the Government itself was unaware of the winding up costs at the time of reaching the contract. Bofors had never spoken anything about it. Only after pressure from political parties the Government itself came to know about the winding up charges and the Government started saying, 'Yes, it is winding up costs'. Now there is authentic proof that there is payment of commission, there are middlemen. And what does the Prime Minister say now? He says if there is commission it is for genuine service. What does it mean? Even the commission is proved. Our Prime Minister justifies the misleading of Bofors, the stance of Bofors. Where was the need for the Prime Minister to justify even the hypothetical payment of commission? Only because the Government is afraid of Bofors, only because the Government is a party to the Bofors deal. It is a shame to the nation

that a person who is leading the nation is alleged with a commission of Rs. 65 crores. With these words I conclude.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Mr Vice-Chairman, the publication of certain documents relating to the Bofors contract by THE HINDU in June this year had injected some psychotropic drug in the body of the opposition resulting in a euphoria which we had witnessed on a number of occassions during the preceding year and a half. However, a similar debate that followed the publication of the documents was totally lack-lustre; and the Opposition was convinced of the futility of their allegation when the honourrable Minister of Defence very brilliantly demolished their case. At that time defeat and resignation were writ large on their faces. Therefore the Opposition was desperately looking for an issue to fight the Government. That is understandable and is the right of the Opposition also. Unfortunately when they failed to do so on political grounds, they resorted to their old game of disinformation and misleading the people of the country to create disaffection against the Government, a popularly elected Government, against which they could possibly find nothing otherwise.

Today's debate emanates from some press conferences of Shri V. P. Singh, the new-found messiah of the Oppostion. Sir, when Shri V. P. Singh found that the halo that he had sought to create around himself was shattering, when he found that his own associates in the Jana Morcha and elsewhere were losing confidence in him, and when he found that those associates of him were privately using highly derogratory and perhaps true words about him, he thought that the compulsions of the situation were such that he had to take some action to draw attraction of the people. By raising a false and baseless allegation that a part of the alleged kickbacks in the Bofors deal stands deposited in a Swiss bank in the name of the Prime Minister, Shri V. P. Singh has drawn attraction all right. But, in the process, he has found the mask on his face falling down a claimant to the exalted public morality platform, his politics of blackmail, of deceit, of chicanery stand abundantly exposed. Having found some success in the past, he seems to have taken people's guilibilty for granted. In these Press conferences which he addressed a few days back, he first claimed that he had fresh evidence in his possession about the payment of kickbacks, etc. in the Bofors deal. Subsequently, he retracted his words to say that his statement was based on the "Hindu" document itself. Sir, if a person professedly as senior as Mr. V. P. Singh claims to be in possession of such conclusive evidence, for which friends on the other side accord to him, that credibility, it was imperative for him, when he levelled an allegation as serious as that, and he was duty-bound, to disclose that evidence to the countrymen. It is a different matter an preposterous to simply say that he corroborates what he had said Today, having said what he has said, Sir, he is in a predicament. But being, as I said, a master of chicanery, he would definitely go to any extent in perpetuating any amount of falsehood to preserve, to maintain, ostensibly the apparent truth about his earlier falsehoods. What the country expects of him today is that he should come out with any evidence that he has with him. He has various platforms available for that including the Parliament. But to say that he would disclose the corroborative evidence, at the appropriate time only shows the malific thinking of his and it only shows that a charge like this is levelled malicrously to keep the controversy alive.

Sir, our thought today goes back to the moment when the issue was first raised in Parliament. As I would not like to repeat in details what the honourable Members have said before me, I would only very briefly say that it was deliberately and mischievously that the Opposition took the decision not to associate itself with the JPC. They knew that if they joined the JPC, they would not be left in any position to challenge the findings of the JPC subsequently. They knew the truth of the matter. They know that the Government of India went in for the best buy,

[Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal]

that we got the best guns at the most competitive prices. But bereft of all the issues, they want to keep this issue alive. And to keep this issue alive, they periodically want the entire focus of the people on this issue of Bofors, and in doing so they are totally unmindful of the other important issues which await discussion by Parliament. We have had the severest of floods in Punjab and elsewhere recently. The Government has come forward with a perspective plan for women. These perhaps are of no concern to them. And permit me to say, Sir, that even issues involved in the matter relating to Bofors contract do not really interest them. All that interests them is to keep the issue alive till the next elections because they are flabbergasted by the progress that this country has made under the leadership of Shri Rajiv Gandhi. They know that various schemes have been launched from time to time for alleviation of poverty in the country, for the welfare of weaker sections of society, and they have nothings really strong to fight the Government. In this process, Sir, they continue to grope in the dark, still not being able to overcome the great shock they received when they were mauled by the Congress at the elections four years back.

Sir, the Opposition parties, I admit, have a glut of leaders. But, unfortunately, they lack leadership. So any discard of the Congress is welcome in their fold. He becomes their leader till the people of the country throw him to the dustbin of history. Today that role is sought to be played by Shri V. P. Singh. Shri V. P. Singh perhaps sees a faint, but I must say; a deceptive, ray of hope to acquire the top-most position in the country. For that he does not mind the compny of CIA's Hershmann or the likes of Haji Mastan.

Sir, on the other hand, his new associates in the Janata Dal and the so called National Front continue to use him with the malicious design to embarrass the Government till the time comes when they are able to overthrow him.

Sir, as the initiator of today's discussion, Mr. Gurupadaswamy, said; the basic issue in the Bofors matter is whether any kickbacks were involved in the transaction, whether any money was paid in whatever form to influence the contract. Unfortunately, Sir, this debate like many other debates in the past has deteriorated to an exercise in semantics. Much has been said as to what a 'commission' is, as to what winding-up charge' is, as to what we mean by 'hypothetical' and various other words like genuine work' that have cropped up during the debate. Sir, I have said that earlier. Fortunately, today I have Mr. Dipen Ghosh present in the House. So, I must pay that compliment to him. I admit that his intellectual power is great. But it is my feeling that his opinion about himself is greater and that sometimes overtakes the former. Sir, today he was dwelling at length on the Prime Minister's interview to the mafiazinge 'Sunday'. Certain important things which form the crux of the matter were conveniently ignored by him. As you all know, it is a long interview, a can did interview, by the Prime Minister. As usual, being a believe in an open form of Government, he has not concealed anything. He is responding to the queries with an open mind of the gentleman who represented the 'Sunday' for this interview. But, Sir, we must mark the words when hes ays: "The question is to whom and for what the payment was made". If it was paid for some genuine work that was done for Bofors, then we cannot question it. What is wrong with it? The Joint Parliamentary Committee has come to a clear finding that no kickback were involved in the matter. As you know, about 64 crores of rupees did pass hands. If the Prime Minister raises a hypothetical question with a pressman and argues—hypothetically, for the purpose of argument—that if this money were to be used by Bofors for making some sort of payment which is not connected with the clinching of the contract, then what is wrong with it, and how can we question it even if it is wrong? We know that French SOFMA and the Swedish Bofors were in a keen run as far as the purchase of 155mm Howitzer gun by India was concerned. The two

firms also knew it. Alongwith these two firms, there four or five other firms in the run. If one or two or all these competitors have their men in other countries trying to know what are the qualities of the gun being offered by that particular country to the prospective purchaser and how can they match or excel that in the production of their weapon, what fault can we find with that? If you extend the argument of the Opposition, tomorrow they would go to the extent of saying that Bofors has paid so much money to its lawyers that it has paid so much money to its engineers. Well, that money must have been out of the receipts of this contract. Sir, this is a ridiculous argument. The question that we are concerned with—I say so and I repeat it to lay emphasis on it—is whether any money passed hands to influence the purchase of the gun by us. If this has not been done, then as to what the Bofors have done with their money—not only these 64 crores of Rupees but with the 1600 crores of rupees—is none of our business. All that we are concerned with is whether any part of that money has in anyform come back to India, whether to Indians or to non-resident Indians, and whether any provision of any Indian law has been violated. If that has happened, we are obviously concerned about it. Sir, not on one but on umpteen occasions, the Prime Minister and the Government have reiterated their commitment to find that out. A reference has been repeatedly made to the Prime Minister's speech on 20th April last year in Lok Sabha. Sir, he had said, "Give us the evidence and we will act". He does not go back on those words. Mr. Aladi Aruna has said that the Prime Minister was then emotive, but today he is finding it difficult to defend those words. That is a travesty of truth, Sir. He was emotive then, he was sincere, he was honest about it and remains so today. Give us the evidence as the Prime Minister has said, the Government would act on it. But be responsible and give evidence. Don't only point an accusing finger, don't only say, it is the Prime Minister himself, who has cornered this amount. And when the Prime Minister comes to the House to refute such a baseless allegation, our friends here have the audacity to say—they lament over his coming that he had to defend himself. It is not the Prime Minister, it is not the Government which have created a situation as that. Unfortunately, it is the Opposition who by their mendacious allegations, by their baseless accusation have created a situation where the Prime Minister of the country has to come and say that he is not involved in this, that no member of his family is involved or that he has no account in any foreign country. It is not the question of a particular incumbent to the office of Prime Minister. It is the question of preserving the dignity and the honour of an exalted office like that of the Prime Minister of a country as India. If our friends, in their anxiety to level all sorts of allegations against the Government, are falling in a trap or working according to the machinations, wittingly or unwittingly of the powers that are hostile to use, of powers that want to weaken India, I think, there is something seriously wrong about their functioning and it is time they go in for some out of self-introspection to find as to where the malady lies and take immediate remedial measures.

Sir, I would like to say only one thing before I conclude. Much mud has been thrown at the leadership of the country in some vain hope that by doing so at least some mud would stick to the leadership, to Rajiv Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India, who during this short period of four years of stewardship of the country has taken the country to a position of envy in the comity of nations, who has taken the country to a position of respect which is acknowledged by all the world leaders.

Sir, it has been said by many of my friends about the way the mind of Shri V. P. Singh has been working in the past. I hope we do not have him today in a state of mind in which he once was said to be when he had given a large chunk of his land in Bhoodan Movement. If that were to be the situation today, if somebody were to raise presumptions as that, that is really bad for the country. Sir, for his baseless allegations, I would not raise a demand as

[Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal]

my hon. Colleagues from this side have done by asking him to take Sanyas. Let us be sure that he is doing all that he is doing not to take Sanyas notwithstanding the public appearances in the form of Mahatma Gandhi or JP. Sir, it is to attain that goal, to attain that position of power that we see all these forms of intrigues and angling from there. I would only say that India is safe in the hands of Rajiv Gandhi. If there is an overwhelming majority of the people of the country who have placed their destiny in his hands, it will be useful if V. P. Singh and his likes observe a period of silence. Thank you.

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, सरकार की असफलता के कारण बोफोर्स कांड में जो नाजायज कमीशन लिया गया, उसकी उचित जांच नहीं हो सकी इसलिये सदन में बार-बार इसी बिन्दु पर हम लोग बहस कर रहे हैं और पिछले 18 महीने से हम लोग इस पर काफी समय दे रहे हैं । अभी शासक पार्टी के लोगों के भाषण सुनने का मौका मिला । उन्होंने कुछ बातें कहीं उसका सारांश है कि एक तो इस बहस में कुछ नयी बात नहीं है, ज्वाइंट पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी ने जांच की, इसके बाद कोई नई बात नहीं है इसमें, दूसरी बात यह है कि विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह के पागलपन के कारण या भ्रष्टाचार के कारण यह सब बात हो रही है और तीसरी बात यह कि आप विपक्ष के लोग वोट के लिये ऐसा कर रहे हैं । ये ही तीन बातें सुनने को मिलीं । अब पहली बात हम कहना चाहेंगे कि विश्व नाथ प्रताप सिंह क्या हैं, नहीं है, वह आप हमसे ज्यादा जानते हैं क्योंकि आप के साथ वह ज्यादा दिन रहे हैं । आपको जो कहना है, कह लीजिये, अब आपका दूसरा नेता भी चला जायेगा उसके बारे में भी यही कहेंगे, हम तो इस पर रोक नहीं लगाते । हमको एक घटना याद आती है । हमारी बस्ती में एक बार एक आदमी के यहां मेहमान आया, वह मेहमान बहरा था, सुनता नहीं था । तो उसको घर वालों ने पूछा कि क्या खाइयेगा तो वह बोला कि मेरे चार पुत्र हैं । फिर घर वाले ने पूछा कि आप मांस-मछली खाते हैं कि नहीं तो उसने कहा कि हम परसों चले जायेंगे । तो वही शासक पार्टी कह रही है । सवाल है यहां कि बोफोर्स कांड में देश का धन किसने गोलमाल किया है, बजाय इसके लिये इस पर विचार करें आप विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह की बात करते है, उस बहरे की तरह और आप लोग समझते हैं कि हम लोग आपकी बात को मान लेंगे । हम लोग तो राजीव गांधी के ढोलिया नहीं है । हमको आप लोग कन्विन्स कर सकते है तथ्यों के जरिये, ढोल बजा कर नहीं ।

श्री मीर्जा इर्शादबेग (गुजरात) : बहरा नहीं, पागल कहिये ।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : हमने कह दिया, आप नहीं थे । अगर वह पागल है तो इसी बहाने आप कोर्ट से फ्री हो जाइये कि पागल आदमी को डाक्यूमेंट पेश करने का कोई अधिकार नहीं है । **(व्यवधान)**

अब बात है कि इसमें नई बात है कि नहीं है । ज्वाइंट पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी के बाद दो बात नई इसमें है। एक तो हिन्दू के कारसपान्डेंट ने जो बात लिखी, पता लगाया और दूसरा विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह ने जो यह कहा कि दिसम्बर, 1986 में जो लोटस कम्पनी के दस्तावेज में यह लिखा कि यदि संभव हो तो भेजने वाले का नाम न लिखा जाये । यह भी एक नई बात है और दोनों मिलकर एक अत्यन्त खतरनाक बात हो जाती है । हमारे सदन के नेता श्री शिव शंकर जी उठे और हिन्दू के कारसपान्डेंट को बधाई दे दी बिना यह सोचे समझें कि अगर हिन्दू के कारसपान्डेंट को बधाई देते हैं तो इस गवर्नमेंट को कन्डम्न कीजिये कि नालायक गवर्नमेंट है । एक पत्रकार जो पता लगा सकता है यह सरकार सारे साधन होते हुये भी पता नहीं

लगा सकी । यहां खतरा यह उपस्थित है कि प्रधानमंत्री यह कह सकते हैं कि औद्योगिक इन्टेलीजेंस के लिये कमीशन लिया गया लेकिन हम लोगों को खतरा यह है कि हमारे देश में जब एक पर एक जासूसी कांड पकड़ा जा रहा है तब अगर ऐसा कमीशन दिया जाता है, और हमारे लोगों को खरीदा जाता है तो देश पर भी, उसके संविधान पर यह भारी खतरे का मसला है । जो सवाल है उस पर तो आप विचार कीजिए, आप उस घटना पर विचार नहीं करते हैं । आप कहते है कि हम लोग वोट के लिये ऐसा कर रहे हैं । ऐसा होता है आप भी वोट के लिये ऐसा काम करते हैं, यह
7.00 P.M. बात किसी से छिपी हुई नहीं है । लेकिन अखबार वालों को क्या जरूरत पड़ी है आपके खिलाफ लिखने की ? वे तो वोट के लिये नहीं खड़े होंगे । सारे देश के अखबार लिख रहे हैं, एक दो नहीं, आपके जो खिलाफ हैं वे ही नहीं लिख रहे हैं । जो आपकी फैमिली के अखबार हैं, मंडे के कारस्पोंडेंट ने जितने भी संबंधित प्रश्न पूछे हैं, जो भी छपा है वे आपके ही अखबार हैं । वह ऐसे सवाल कर रहे है जो यह साबित करता है आपका इस भ्रष्टाचार में कुछ न कुछ संबंध है । और हमारे अखबार में आता, कम्युनिस्ट अखबार में आता तो उसको आप छोड़ दीजिये । लेकिन मेरे पास 15 नवम्बर का इकानामिक टाइम्स है । इलाहाबाद जाकर आपने देख लिया और आगे देखना है तो रूकिये । हमारी बात आप नहीं सुनते है, हमारी बात आपको पसन्द नहीं आती है तो इलाहाबाद की आवाज सुनिये और उसके लिये देश तैयार है । मैं नई स्थिति के संबंध में उसके संपादकीय से आपको पढ़कर पुनः देना चाहता हूं :

"....There is a further issue of some importance. The Prime Minister's statements on the nature of the payments have done a great harm to his credibility."

देश के लोग कह रहे है कि प्रधान मंत्री की क्रेडिबिलिटी बहुत तेजी से गिरती जा रही है और मैं अपनी ओर से आपसे कहूंगा कि हमारे देश में एक भी ऐसा प्रधान मंत्री नहीं हुआ था, जिसकी क्रेडिबिलिटी इतनी नीची चली गई हो । आपको मानना है तो मान सकते हैं, नहीं मानना है तो यह आपके ऊपर है । यह क्या लिखता है :

"From no payment of any money to any person in connection with the contract, the country has been led through winding up charges to what is wrong with commission paid for some genuine work!...."

ये सारी बातें कौन लोग पूछ रहे हैं, इनका जवाब देना चाहिये । संपादकीय में आखिर में लिखा है .

"....What prevents the Prime Minister from ordering a fresh and independent enquiry in the wake of disclosures made by *The Hindu* and now by Mr. V. P. Singh? That would be far more graceful on his part than encouraging his minions to indulge in a slanging match of counter allegations which makes a further dent in the credibility of the ruling party."

अगर आप यही चीज चाहते हैं तो हम आपको रोक नहीं सकते लेकिन हम आपसे कहना चाहते हैं कि देश की इस नाजुक घड़ी में जब अखबारों में एक राष्ट्रीय अहम का प्रश्न उठाया गया है तो आप ढोलिया का काम मत कीजिए । प्रधान मंत्री भी ऐसी गंभीर बात पर इस तरह क्यों बोलते हैं । तरह-तरह की बातें क्यों बोल देते हैं ? बोलते समय कोई ख्याल ही नहीं करते ? प्रधानमंत्री कहते हैं कि वह सबसे अच्छे ढंग से सरकार चला रहे हैं । कोई विश्वास करेगा कि जवाहरलाल नेहरू और इंदिरा गांधी से अधिक अच्छे ढंग से वे सरकार चला रहे हैं ? आप कुछ भी बोलिए लेकिन ढोलिया ड्रम बीटर के अलावा कोई इन बातों पर विश्वास नहीं करेगा ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय प्रधान मंत्री ने मिस्टर क्लीन से शुरू किया था । हमको लगता है कि वे डर्टियेस्ट प्रधान मंत्री होने जा रहे हैं । पहले के सभी प्रधान मंत्री हमारी कोशिशों से सफेद नहीं हो गए । आप उनको पूजते रहिए ढोल पीटते रहिए ।

[श्री चतुरानन मिश्र]

कुछ बातें ऐसी हैं जिनको साफ करना चाहिए । बोफोर्स से खरीदगी में कमीशन लिया गया यह अब स्पष्ट है लेकिन पहले से सरकार हमको नहीं कहती है स्वीडिश रेडियो कहता है कि तुम्हारा रुपया चोरों चला गया । हिन्दू अखबार क्यों कहेगा सरकार क्यों नहीं कहेगी ? विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह क्यों कहते हैं ? हिन्दू में पब्लिश होने के बाद पहले सरकार सदन में क्यों नहीं आई कि अभी-अभी जो बातें प्रकाशित हुई हैं ये खतरनाक बातें हैं। बहुराष्ट्रीय कंपनियों की चालें हमको पता नहीं लग रही हैं, आइए हम सब मिलकर इसका पता लगाएं । यह ऐटोट्यूड आप नहीं ले रहे हैं । आप लाइयर बन रहे हैं । आपके कहने से लगता है कि बिना कमीशन के गन अच्छी नहीं मिल सकती हैं । इसलिए जो मुख्य मुद्दे हैं उनको आप नहीं लेते हैं उनके मुताबिक काम नहीं करते हैं । सदन को जो आश्वासन दिया था वह प्रधान मंत्री ने दिया था । हम कहते है आज जो हमारे सदन के नेता बोले हैं हम चाहेंगे रक्षा मंत्री जी उसको साफ करें वह गलत बात है। गवर्नमेंट का डिसिजन यह है कि कोई भी मिडिल मेन इस सौदेबाजी में उसका इस्तेमाल नहीं करेगा । आज उन्होंने कहा है नहीं यह नहीं है उसमें । उसमें यह है कि जुनुइन काम के लिए मिडिल मैन किया जायेगा यह किस गवर्नमेंट का डाकुमेंट है ? अगर है तो सदन के सामने रख दें तब हम लोग नहीं बोलेंगे ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Mr. Shiv Shanker has not said like that. He said that this is what has appeared in the article, in the interview.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: This is what he said.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: You are not to interpret.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: The Chair should not interpret.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: I raised the question, what is the Government order. The whole thing arises out of the good thing done by Mr Rajiv Gandhi that no middlemen will be used and no commission will be paid for this purpose. This was good on his part. What has happened? This has been violated and certain things have taken place. And you people are defending it. This further confuses the people and creates suspicion in the minds of the people that you are the sharer in that commission.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: Shareholder.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: Shareholder or not will be decided later on.

मैं आपसे कहूंगा कि नवभारत टाइम्स में प्रधान मंत्री ने दिया था कि विदेशों में जिन लोगों ने गैर कानूनी ढंग से धन जमा किया हुआ है उन सब पर हम सख्त कार्रवाई करेंगे । आप बताइये किस पर सख्त कार्रवाई आपने की है । अगर आप नहीं करते तो क्या हम नहीं कहेंगे कि झूठा आश्वासन दिया है । आप नहीं करना चाहते तो मत करिये । मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि पार्लियामेंट से सैक्शन 105 सी०आर० पी० सी० को आपने अमेंडमेंट करा लिया । यह जायज किया आपने । अमेंडमेंट करने के बाद क्या किया आपने ? आपने कहा ऐसे लोगों पर केस करेंगे । अगर आपने केस इंस्टीट्यूट किया होता तो स्विस बैंक या स्विडिश गवर्नमेंट मजबूर होती क्रिमिनल केस में सारी बातें कहने पर सारी चीजें सामने आ जातीं । आपने केस नहीं किया । किसी पर केस नहीं किया तो क्यों सैक्शन 105 अमेंड किया । कोई भी काम आपने नहीं किया यही हमारी चार्ज है और आप इसको छिपाते हैं सारी चीजें सप्रेस करते हैं ।

हमारा दूसरा चार्ज यह है कि रक्षा मंत्री इसको साफ करें कि 17 दिसम्बर को भारत सरकार और स्विटजरलैंड के बीच एक समझौता हुआ कि जिन लोगों

ने इस तरह से नजायज धन जमा किया है उनको डिटेक्ट करने में दोनों सरकारें एक दूसरे की सहायता करेंगी । इसको एक साल से ज्यादा हो गया लेकिन कुछ नहीं हुआ । अगर आप सारा कारेसपोंडेंस हम लोगों के सामने रखते तो हम क्वीस हो जाते कि आपने कोशिश की है और हम आप पर एलीगेशन नहीं लगायेंगे । अगर छिपाते चले जायेंगे और सेक्शन 105 के मुताबिक कोई काम नहीं किया तो क्यों नहीं हम डाउट करेंगे । 17 दिसम्बर को भारत और स्विटजरलैंड के बीच समझौता करके आप कोई कार्रवाई नहीं करते तब हम क्यों नहीं शक करेंगे । निश्चय कहेंगे आपने छिपाया है । चोर लोगों को छिपाया है । इसीलिए दरपेश सवाल यह है और हम यह जानना चाहेंगे कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री अगर कम उम्र के हैं वह नहीं समझ सकते तो क्या आपकी पार्टी में कोई ऐसा आदमी नहीं है जो उनको जाकर यह कह सके कि यह मामला एक सौ करोड़ का नहीं है मामला है प्रधान मंत्री के ऊपर काली छाया पड़ने का । यह इस देश में कभी नहीं हुआ । यह अत्यन्त खतरनाक है । वह आपकी प्रतिष्ठा के लिए घातक है सारे देश के लिए भी घातक हैं । अभी उन्होंने 500 करोड़ नहीं 800 करोड़ की बात कही है। 800 करोड़ की क्या ज्यादा कीमत है प्रधान मंत्री की इज्जत से । क्यों नहीं आप इस पर कार्रवाई करते ?

अब बात आती है बोफोर्स की कि कार्रवाई करनी चाहिए या नहीं करनी चाहिए और करनी चाहिए तो कैसी करनी चाहिए । हम लोगों का यह कहना है कि उसका पता लगाने के लिए बोफोर्स ने जो आपका आदेश था अच्छा आदेश था उसको वायलेट किया । अगर वायलेशन के चार्ज पर हम उस कान्ट्रेक्ट टरमिनेट करेंगे या ब्लैकलिस्ट करेंगे तो दुनिया की कोई भी कोर्ट इसको नजायज नहीं कहेगी क्योंकि आपने पहले ही कह दिया था कि कोई कांट्रेक्ट का मिसयूज नहीं होना चाहिए मिडिल मैन नहीं होना चाहिए । अगर उन्होंने किया है तो यह नजायज है । हम इस पर एक्शन ले सकते हैं । आप लोग और प्रधान मंत्री कहते है कि देश का रुपया बचाने के लिए हम ऐसा करते हैं । हनको ऐसा लगता है कि उस लड़की की तरह सरकार सफाई दे रही है जो इलिसिट कनेक्शन में थी किन्तु बार-बार छिपाये जाती थी कि इलिसिट कनेक्शन है । लेकिन जब डिलीवरी का दिन आया तो पर्दा उठ गया । तो अभी आपकी डिलीवरी हो रही है । सुन लीजिए हमारी बात । रक्षा मंत्री जी आपको पसंद न हो तो कह दीजिए कि बकवास करके चले गये । फिर नाम प्रकाशित होगा । आप नहीं खोज पाइयेगा । इसमें दूसरे लोग इन्वोल्ड हैं । आप लोग छोटे आदमी हैं । उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय जिन-जिन कम्पनियों का सौदा नहीं लिया गया है वे सभी इसमें लगी हुई हैं । वे ही कागजात निकालती हैं वे ही छाप करके देंगी । यह तो हर जगह बिजिनेस होता है । इसीलिए कल चल करके नाम छापा जायेगा । इलेक्शन नजदीक आने दीजिए नाम भी आ जायेगा । तब फिर आप ढोल लेकर बजाते चलिएगा कि आप लोग झूठ कह रहे हैं आप लोग झूठ कह रहे हैं । सावधान हो जाइये । हम आपको अभी भी कह रहे है गलतियों से सबक लीजिए । देखने की कोशिश कीजिए ।

आखिर में अखबार जो निकला है उसके बारे में एक अण्डर कोटेशन है इसलिए मैं उसको पढ़कर सुना देता हूं यह "इंडियन एक्सप्रेस" के उस लेख से है ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश देसाई) : यह नूरानी के आर्टिकिल से है ।... **(व्यवधान)**

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : हां हमारा दूसरा विषय है । पूरा आर्टिकल तो मैं पढ़ नहीं सकता हूं । एक पहलू है जिसको रक्षा मंत्री जी साफ करें अगर कार्य किये हुए हैं तो :

"On July 20 the spokesman of the Swiss Justice Department said that Switzerland was willing to provide the required assistance but till date we have not received any request from India concerning this case."

[श्री चतुरानन मिश्र]

यह विदित इन्वर्टेड कामा है । अगर गलत है तो अखबार पर आप केस चला सकते थे । कोई रोकता तो नहीं । आपने कहा कि भूदान की सारी जमीन विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह जी की पत्नी ने अपने शौहर को पागल करार देकर हड़प कर रख ली। उन्होंने तो पब्लिकली दे दिया, उन पर केस चलाते हुए । लेकिन आपको क्या हो रहा है । हमको दूसरी बात लग रही है । जब यह चोरी पकड़ी जा रही है, यह हम नहीं कह रहे है कि आप ही चोर हैं यह हमने नहीं कहा ... (व्यवधान)

प्रो० सौरीन्द्र भट्टाचार्य : अभी तक नहीं बोल रहे हैं ।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : हमने कहा कि आप उनके शागिर्द हो सकते हैं ऐसी स्थिति हो गयी है । उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय एक जगह ऐसा हुआ कि एक चोर पकड़ा गया (व्यवधान) जस्ट मैं कन्क्लूड करता हूं । एक चोर पकड़ा गया तो चोर ही हल्ला करने लगा "चोर", "चोर", इतना हल्ला किया कि सब भागकर उधर चले गये । अब सरकार की चोरी पकड़ने लगी है तो तो आप ही हल्ला कर रहे हैं कि विश्वनाथ जी चोर हैं, ये चोर है वो चोर है । अगर चोर हैं तो पकड़ कर जेल में रखो । हम आपको कहने जायें तब ना, कि आपने उनको क्यों पकड़ कर रख दिया ? आपको कोई रोकता तो नहीं है । यह बात न करके आप उल्टी बात कर रहे हैं । पहले अपने हाथ साफ कीजिये तब इंसाफ मांगिये । अगर अपने हाथ में बघनखा रखेंगे तो फिर आपको इंसाफ नहीं मिलेगा । इसलिये अंतिम बात कहकर समाप्त करता हूं कि अगर गवर्नमेंट यह बात साबित नहीं करती है जो 17 सितम्बर का एग्रीमेंट हुआ था हमारे और स्विटजरलैंड के बीच में और जिसके मुताबिक फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर ने लोक सभा में कहा था कि अब कार्यवाही की जा सकती है, उसके मुताबिक कोई कार्यवाही नहीं की गयी, अगर सी०आर०पी०सी० के अमेंडमेंट के मुताबिक कोई कार्यवाही नहीं हुई और अगर यह सच बात है जैसा कि 20 जुलाई को स्विस डिपार्टमेंट ने कहा कि इंडिया के केस परस्यू नहीं किया तब हम आपसे मांग करते हैं कि आपकी सरकार इस्तीफा दे, आप नालायक है, आप राज चलाने के लायक नहीं है । हम ज्वाइंट पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी बैठा करके क्या करेंगे अगर आप सारी चीजों को छिपा रहे हैं और अगर यही स्थिति है । हमारा दूसरा सुझाव होगा कि सब आपोजीशन वालों की मीटिंग बुलाइये और कहिये कि यह राष्ट्रीय महत्व की घटना घटी है, सभी मिलकर इसका रास्ता निकालें । यह तभी होगा जब ईमानदारी से आप चीजों को प्रस्तुत करेंगे । अभी जो आप कर रहे हैं वह सारी चीजों को छिपा रहे हैं, इसीलिये आपकी यह कार्यवाही निन्दात्मक है । धन्यवाद ।

श्री दरबारा सिंह (पंजाब) : वाइस चेयरमैन साहब,

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश देसाई) : केवल 10 मिनट ।

श्री दरबारा सिंह : बहुत कुछ सुना मैंने अपोजीशन को हमारे एक मेम्बर जो हमारे साथ ज्वाइंट पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी में थे उन्होंने एक एलीगेशन लगाया है कि आंख मूंदकर, ब्लाइंडली, मदद की है सरकार की कमेटी ने । मैं समझता हूं कि उन्होंने कोई कसर नहीं छोड़ी । जो उन्होंने वहां कहा, उसको उन्होंने आज यहां दोहराया है । अगर उनको कोई अलहिदा बात कहनी होती तो उसको कहते । लेकिन मैं इसके बारे में कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता हूं । मैं समझता हूं कि आंख मूंदकर, ब्लाइंडली, जो खबर बाहर से आती थी उसी को वे अपने ढंग से पेश करते थे । मैं एक बात कह दूं जिससे आप को इस बात का पता चल जायेगा । वे वहां कहते थे कि इंडियन एक्सप्रेस के एडीटर को जरूर बुलाया जाये । क्या मतलब था इसका ? मतलब यही

था कि जो वे कहते थे उसकी रिपोर्ट उनको कहां से मिलती थी यह इससे साफ पता लगता है। मुझे अब इस बारे में ज्यादा कुछ नहीं कहना है। लेकिन मैं दो-तीन बातें जरूर अर्ज करना चाहता हूं। बोफोर्स से मैंने खुद क्वेश्चन किया है :

whether Prime Minister and his family are involved in these kick-backs or, what is called, commission. The reply was in two words: "Absolutely not".

यह उनका कहना है यह मैं समझता हूं। उन्होंने क्या कहा हमें इससे क्या। हम तो यह कहते हैं कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने जो बयान दिया है, आज उसको तोड़-मरोड़कर, उसको ध्वस्त करके इस तरह से पेश किया जा रहा है। प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने इस हाउस में, उस हाउस में, बाहर, हर जगह यह कहा बार-बार यह कहा कि हमारा इस में इन्वाल्वमेंट नहीं है। लेकिन आप इस पर विश्वास नहीं करते। आप विश्वास उन लोगों पर करते हैं जो किसी न किसी ढंग से अखबार वालों को फैब्रिकेटेड चीजें देते हैं और वही यहां आकर कहते हैं। फैब्रिकेटेड इसलिये मैं कहता हूं कि अगर वी०पी० सिंह यह कहता है कि यह ठीक है तो उस के बारे में जो कहा गया है, साठे जी ने जो कहा है, तो वह सही है या गलत उसका जवाब क्यों नहीं दिया ? जब उससे पूछा गया और कहा गया कि आप इसकी अथेंटिसिटी को साबित करें, इसको प्रव करें तो व वहां से निकल गये। ... **(व्यवधान)** ...आप चुप रहिये मैं आपसे बोलता नहीं। मैं चेयर को एड्रेस कर रहा हूं। मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूं और मैं उसके खिलाफ कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता। लेकिन मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूं कि आपको उसके कंडक्ट की नाप तोल करनी पड़ेगी। वह यू० पी० में चीफ मिनिस्टर थे। वहां क्या कुछ किया, वहां से कैसे छोड़कर आये और यहां चले आये। यहां आकर उन्होंने जो काम किया मुझे उसका पता है। उनके दस्तखत मौजूद हैं। बोफोर्स को जो पैसा दिया गया, उन्हें सब कुछ पता था और बतौर फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर उनके उस पर दस्तखत किये हुए हैं। मैं इसमें आगे नहीं जाना चाहता लेकिन मैं कहता हूं और अपोजीशन के लिये कहना चाहता हूं ताकि उनको रिमांड हो जाय। उन्होंने कहा था कि हमारे लीडर राजीव गांधी है। इसके साथ ही उन्होंने यह भी कहा था कि मैंने कांग्रेस नहीं छोड़ी, मेरा झंडा तिरंगा झंडा है और उसके साथ लिपटकर मैं मरूंगा। मुझे नहीं पता कुछ दिनों के बाद कैसे ख्याल आया। अगर यह ख्याल-ख्यामी नहीं है, अगर यह बात सही नहीं है तो वह यह क्यों कहते रहे ? उन्होंने यू० पी० में क्या किया, कहां गये, कहां से आये---वह यह साबित करता है कि वे कभी अपनी एक बात पर डटे रहकर कोई बात नहीं कहते। हमेशा गलत बयानी करते है और कनफ्यूजन में रहकर अपना सारा जीवन व्यतीत करने का फैसला कर चुके है। आप उन को लीडर मानते हैं, मुझे इस में कोई एतराज नहीं है। आप मानें, लेकिन आधी पार्टी इधर है आधी पार्टी उधर है। "इक दिल के टुकड़े हजार हुये, कोई यहां गिरा कोई वहां गिरा।" आप अंदाज लगाइये कि यह जो पार्टियां है तो जब उनका कनफ्यूज्ड लीडर है तो क्या हालत होगी इल्जाम लगाना आसान है, लेकिन उस को साबित करना मुश्किल है, इसलिये आप उसको कहें कि इल्जाम को साबित करें। प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने कहा है कि सी० बी० आई० इंक्वायरी कर रही है। उसके नतीजें देखें कि क्या निकलते हैं। उसके बाद प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने यह भी कहा है कि हमने स्विटजरलैंड के साथ संधि करने के लिये कदम उठाये हैं। उसके लिये भी जो "संडे" जिसमें से आपने पढ़कर सुनाया है, उसी में लिखा हुआ है। उन्होंने कहा है दो, चार, पांच महीने निकले है, अब कुछ देर लगनी है कोई प्रोसेस होता है उस प्रोसेस से सारी बातें निकलेंगी, तो इस में प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने कौन सी गलत बात कही है? वाइस चेयरमैन साहब, मैं यह अर्ज करता हूं, मैं एक ही बात कहता हूं कि पिछले दिनों इस दिल्ली के मकाम पर दो दिन

[श्री दरबारा सिंह]

एक इजलास हुआ जिस में हमने लोगों की बेहतरी के लिये जो लोग पावर्टी लाइन के नीचे हैं उनके लिये आर्थिक व्यवस्था के ढांचे के बदलने के लिये खराबियों को दूर करने के लिये, उनको रोटी, कपड़ा मकान, तालीम और इलाज की सहूलियतें देने के लिये जिसको सोशलिज्म कहते है उसको लाने के लिये हमने एक सवाल ही नहीं उठाया बल्कि उसको प्रैक्टीकल शेप देने के लिये हमने बात कही है। दो दिनों में यहां जो कुछ हुआ उससे यह बौखला उठे हैं। क्योंकि इनको तो पता ही नहीं है कि उनके क्या प्रोग्राम है।

[उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री आनन्द शर्मा) पीठासीन हुये]

वह कहते है 70–71 प्रोग्राम बनाये हुये हैं हम यह करेंगे, वह करेंगे। क्या करेंगे उनको पता भी नहीं है। अगर उन में से एक आदमी यहां जो बैठे हैं या जो उनके साथ हैं वह 71 का नाम ही बता दें कि वह कौन सी चीज करना चाहते हैं, खाक करना चाहते हैं, हिन्दुस्तान को मिटाना चाहते हैं, हिन्दुस्तान की दुर्गति करना चाहते हैं। इलाहाबाद की यहां पर किसी ने बात छेड़ दी मैं नहीं छेड़ना चाहता था कि उस में कौन-कौन से सहायक गये, हमारे खिलाफ यह कहा गया कि एक आदमी जिसने रामायण में पले किया था उसके खिलाफ कहा गया। हम यह पूछते है कि वहां हाजी मस्तान किस की हिमायत में गया, वहां सब से बड़ा फिरकेदार कम्युनल आदमी बुखारी किस के हक में गया और फिर राज बब्बर गया, यह क्या है, क्या कोई खिलौना है जितने आदमी गये किसी ने यह बात कही, कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी जो अपने आप को प्रोग्रेसिव कहते है क्या उन्होंने भी यह कहा कि यह आदमी गलत आये है हम आपका साथ देने के लिये तैयार नहीं है। बहुत सी जगहों से कूड़ा इकट्ठा कर के हम पर आप अटैक करते हैं मुझे यह समझ नहीं आया। इलाहाबाद में आपने क्या किया है। ठीक है, हमारी गलतियां हुई तो हम दुरुस्त करेंगे। हम यह नहीं यकीन कर सकते कि आप किसी परपज के लिए काम नहीं कर रहे है। अपोजीशन का परपज यह है अगर किसी एक ही आदमी पर बार बार अटैक किया जाय तो उसका असर जरुर पड़ेगा और वह है प्राइम-मिनिस्टर अगर प्राइम मिनिस्टर पर अटैक होता है तो यह जायेगा और सारा मुल्क जायेगा क्यों कि आपके पास तो लीडर है ही नहीं। अगर लीडर आपके पास होता तो ऐसा होता जिसमें जान हो, जिसमें समाजी ताकत हो जिसमें फैसला लेने की जुर्रत हो जिसमें आगे बढ़ने की ताकत हो। वह तो किसी में है ही नहीं। अगर वह किसी में है तो आज कहता हूं और कल भी कहूंगा कि हिन्दुस्तान में दूसरा शख्स ऐसा नहीं है जो हिन्दुस्तान को इकट्ठा कर के आगे चला सके सिवाय एक इन्सान के जो राजीव गांधी है। अब आप उसको छोटा कहें, बचपन कहे, इम्मच्योर कहें, इस दुनियां में उन्होंने तीसरी ताकत खड़ी कर के बता दिया है कि हिन्दुस्तान तीसरी ताकत है। यह उसने बताया है, उसने किया है, आपने तो नहीं किया है। उसने हर जगह पर जाकर, हर आदमी से, हर मुल्क से बात कर के अपनी ताकत को बनाया है और महात्मा गांधी के पैरोकार बने हैं और कहा है कि दुनियां की तबाही को रोकने के लिये सिर्फ एक ही तरीका है वह नान वायलेंस से हम काम ले सकते हैं। एक तरफ दुनियां की ताकत उन्होंने बनाई है दूसरी तरफ यहां के आर्थिक ढांचे को दुरस्त करने के लिये हिन्दुस्तान के हालात को बदलने के लिये और फिरकापरस्ती का मुकाबला करने के लिये काम किया है। इससे हिन्दुस्तान को तोड़ने वाले जो तत्व हैं उनके दिमाग में एक हलचल पैदा हुई है और दिमाग की कैफियत इस बात में आई है कि बार-बार आप अटेक कर रहे हैं। मैं तो यह कहता हूं कि जब उन्होंने कहा है कि हम देख रहे है उनके साथ बात करेंगे जो कुछ भी निकलेगा हम देंगे तो इसमें क्या गलत बात उन्होंने

कह दी है । यह कहते है 99921–पी.यू. टी.यू., पता नहीं क्या क्या कहते हैं, पता नहीं कहां से आया है, यह बतायें और वह इसको साबित करें जो यह कहते हैं लेकिन आज पार्लियामेंट में उस हाऊस में कुछ नहीं कह सके और दूसरा मुंह लेकर चले गये ; मैं बहुत नहीं कहना चाहता, बहुत जानता हूं लेकिन वाइस चेयरमैन साहब मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि जो रिपोर्ट हमने दी थी जिसके चेयरमैन हमारे शंकरानन्द जी थे । वह किसी सरकार के पक्ष में नहीं दी । जो फैक्ट्स हमारे पास आये जो आपोजीशन ने हमारे आनरेबल मेम्बर के हाथ दिये, जो कुछ भी वे दे सकते थे वह सब कुछ दिया और इन सबको सामने रखकर ही हमने फैसला किया, बेशक 64 करोड़ का हो या किसी और चीज का हो । हमने सारे फैक्ट्स रखे है । यह भी है कि जो ठीक बात थी वह हमने रखी । अगर जनरल्स ने कहा कि बहुत अच्छी गन है तो हमने वह जिक्र भी किया, अगर किसी ने कहा यह बात होनी चाहिये तो हमने वह भी जिक्र किया । सब कुछ किया । अब ट्विस्ट करके किसी चीज को लेना, अखबारों से खबरें लेना क्या यह ठीक है । आपको प्राइम मिनिस्टर पर यकीन नहीं है । आपको अपने पर यकीन नहीं है और जो आदमी दूसरे पर यकीन नहीं करता वह समझता है कि वह खुद मशकूक है, इसलिये मशकूक होकर आप हमसे बात मत करें । लोग कहते है बाहर क्या कहते है । उन्होंने कहा कि ये सांसद है, ये पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर हैं जो सारा दिन "बोफोर्स", "बोफोर्स" कहते हैं, सपने में भी, बाहर भी, खाने में भी, पहनने में भी, यहां आकर, वहां जाकर, हर जगह यही कहते हैं "बोफोर्स", "बोफोर्स" । यह कोई पूजा पाठ की बात क्या आप कर रहे हैं, यह मुझे बताइये । कोई और प्रोग्राम नहीं है आपके पास सिवाय इस बोफोर्स के प्रोग्राम के ? दूसरा प्रोग्राम चाहे हिन्दुस्तान की शक्ति बनाने का हो.. (**व्यवधान**) इनके हाथ बन्द नहीं करते तो जबान तो बन्द कीजिये ।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : एक ही आपके लिये काफी है ।

श्री दरबारा सिंह : रिस्पांसिबिलिटी से काम लीजिये । मैं फिर कहता हूं कि आपोजीशन का काम आपोजीशन करना होता है लेकिन कन्स्ट्रक्टिव, डिस्ट्रक्टिव नहीं । हिन्दुस्तान की आज की हालत जो है उसमें से हम क्या बढ़ चढ़कर कर सकते हैं, हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों के लिये, गरीबों के लिये और इनको आगे मजबूत बनाने के लिये ताकि दुनिया में इसकी ताकत बने और हिन्दुस्तान इनके लिये मजबूत बन सके क्या इसके लिये आपका कोई प्रोग्राम है । एक ही प्रोग्राम रखे हुये हैं कि "ही मस्ट गो, प्राइम मिनिस्टर मस्ट गो, ही शुड रिजाइन, आप तो मेरे ख्याल में श्मशान भूमि के मारे है और कुछ नहीं लगता है । आप सिर्फ यही चाहते हैं कि यहां श्मशान भूमि बन जाय और लोग लड़ लड़कर मर जायें । आज इस हद तक जो कुछ हो रहा है मुझे ऐसा लगता है कहीं आप इनकी मदद तो नहीं कर रहे है, ऐसे अल्फाज कहकर कि इनको ऐसा डिसक्रेडिट किया जाये । वे लगे हुये हैं सरहद पर आप लगे हुये हैं हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर । आप हिन्दुस्तान के इस लीडर को खत्म करना चाहते हैं, वे खत्म करना चाहते हैं हिन्दुस्तान को, आया कहीं इस बात के लिए मिलीभगत तो नहीं हो गयी है । मैं कहता हूं कि आप अपने अंदर झाककर देखिए कि आप क्या कर रहे है ... (**व्यवधान**) इनकी जुबान पर कुछ तो काबू होना चाहिए । आप नहीं कर सकते कुछ तो अपना जरा बाहर जाकर पानी वगैरह पीकर आ जायें ताकि मैं इस समय खत्म कर लूं । मैं सिर्फ आखिर में यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि मुल्क चाहता है कि मुल्क की तरक्की हो, मुल्क चाहता है कि यहां स्टेबिलिटी हो, लोग चाहते हैं कि लोगों को रोटी, कपड़ा, मकान, तालीम और अनाज ये पांच चीजे मिलें । इसके लिए आप हमारे साथ हों । मैं समझता हूं कि यह ठीक है । आप कभी किसी भी बात को उठाते हैं कभी दूसरी को आपको

[श्री दरबारा सिंह]

कहा आओ पंजाब पर बात करें तो आप छुप रहे हैं । आप कहते हैं कि ये लीडर हैं फलां लीडर है । आपका कोई लीडर नहीं है । ठीक कहा आज प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने कि इनका कोई लीडर ही नहीं है, किससे बात करें । कोई आता नहीं कोई जाता नहीं सब अपने अपने लीडर हैं, आधे यहां बैठे हैं आधे लीडर बाहर बैठे हैं, एक दूसरे को गाली निकालते हैं आधे सुनते हैं । आपकी क्या रूपरेखा बन गयी है । आप अपना घर सुधारिए हम तो यह कहना चाहते हैं । हम आपकी मदद करना चाहते हैं आपसे सिम्पैथाइज होना चाहते हैं । इसलिए आप इस बात पर आइये और जो प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने बयान पार्लियामेंट में दिया है वह उस पर स्टैंड करते हैं और न उन्होंने कोई पैसा लिया न उनकी फैमिली ने लिया न किसी हिंदुस्तानी ने लिया है जिसने लिया उसकी इन्क्वायरी सी.बी.आई. कर रही है । इन्हीं अल्फाज के साथ आपका शुक्रिया ।

श्री मीर्जा इर्शादबेग : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, झूठ के निरंतर अनर्गल प्रलाप से विपक्ष झूठ को सच और सच को झूठ करने की एक विफल चेष्टा कर रहा है । मैंने भारतीय इतिहास के पन्ने उठाकर देखे हैं । राजनीति में मुझे यह महसूस होता है कि हिंदुस्तान का विपक्ष आज जिस मात्रा में हताश है शायद ऐसा हताश वह पहले के किसी भी समय में नहीं रहा है और अपनी हताशा को यह चेष्टा में परिणित कर रहा है—नीतिविहीन दिशा-विहीन कार्यक्रम-विहीन और यह कहिये कि बुद्धि-विहीन कार्यक्रमों पर अपना पूरा जोर लगा करके देश में लोकतांत्रिक ढांचे को विफल करने का प्रयास जो कर रहे हैं इससे देश की जनता आपको कभी माफ नहीं कर सकती ।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : आप तथ्यों के आधार पर देखिये । . . . **(व्यवधान)**

श्री मीर्जा इर्शादबेग : तथ्यों के आधार पर देखिये सरकार की चेष्टा पर देखिये और सरकार के कार्यक्रम पर देखिये कि वह देश के जन-जन के कल्याण के लिए क्या करने जा रही है ।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : भ्रष्ट सरकार कुछ नहीं कर सकती ।

श्री मीर्जा इर्शादबेग : आपके मानस में भ्रष्टता है आपकी नीति में भ्रष्टता है, आपके दिलों में भ्रष्टता है कि और इसी कारण वह सत्य को सत्य के स्वरूप में नहीं देख सकते है और इसी वजह से आज का जो विपक्ष है वह यह नहीं देख रहा है कि देश का कल्याण किन कार्यक्रमों में है देश को कौन सही दिशा दे रहा है और किस दिशा में हम जा रहे है । मिश्र जी चले गये है बैठते तो मैं उनको बताता कि यह बात नहीं है . . . **(व्यवधान)**

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: चालीस साल का इतिहास बतायेगा सही दिशा । . . . **(व्यवधान)**

श्री मीर्जा इर्शादबेग : मिश्र जी चले गये है, बैठते तो मैं उनको बताता कि यह बात नहीं है कि राजीव गांधी का नाम लेकर के उनकी सरकार के कार्यक्रमों का नाम लेकर जो बात आप कहने जा रहे है मैं पूछता हूं आज आप कह रहे है कि पं. नेहरू के जमान में ऐसी कोई बात नहीं थी इंदिरा गांधी के जमाने मे कोई ऐसी बात नहीं थी, इतना आज उत्कृष्टताओं के नीचे जा रहे हैं, मैं उन्हीं से पूछना चाहता हूं—मिश्र जी है नहीं—उन्हीं की पार्टी के लोगों ने यह कहा था जब पं० नेहरू ने भाखडा नांगल बांध कार्यक्रम की बात की जब उन्होंने भिलाई की बात की तब आपकी ही पार्टी थी जिन्होंने यह कहा था कि —

Nehru is suffering from gigantism.

वह यही लोग थे और आज कह रहे हैं कि नेहरू की नीतियां सर्वश्रेष्ट थीं, उत्कृष्ट थी—और वह भी तब जब वह नहीं रहे ।

इंदिरा गांधी के जमाने में आपने इंदिरा गांधी को क्रिटिसाईज़ किया । यहां तक कि सरकार के कार्यक्रमों को लेकर

ऐसी चेष्टायें की गई । श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी हिंदुस्तान के इतिहास को काल संदूक में दबाकर आने वाली पीढ़ियों को बताना चाहती थी हिंदुस्तान का भूतकाल क्या था । इन्होंने खोल लिया उसको और देखा कि उसमें से कुछ नहीं निकला । जो कार्यक्रम इंदिरा गांधी ने किये, यही सदन उसको गवाही और साक्षी देता है ।

देश के जन-जन के कल्याण के लिए बैंकों के राष्ट्रीयकरण के कार्यक्रम का जब यहां पर प्रस्ताव लाया गया, मैं पूछना चाहता हूं राम अवधेश सिंह जी से कि आपका साथ देने वाले कौन से पक्ष के लोग थे ? देश के इतिहास को विफल करने में कौन से लोगों ने साथ दिया ? यह वही लोग थे ... **(व्यवधान)**

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : आपको मालूम भी है कि बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण ... **(व्यवधान)**

श्री मीर्जा इर्शादबेग : यह वही लोग जो इन कार्यक्रमों को मानते नहीं थ... (व्यवधान) और आज भी कह रहे हैं कि इंदिरा गांधी के कार्यक्रम उत्कृष्ट थे । ... **(व्यवधान)** जब आप सत्ता में थे... (व्यवधान) आप बैठिये ... **(व्यवधान)** सच्चाई को सुनिये यह कटु सत्य है, इसको सुनिये और बर्दाश्त कीजिए ।... **(व्यवधान)**

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री आनन्द शर्मा) : आपको समय मिला था, आपने अपनी बात कह दी है । अब आप उनकी बात सुनिये ।

श्री मीर्जा इर्शादबेग : मैं बोफर्स पर भी कह सकता हूं... **(व्यवधान)** बोफर्स समिति के एक सदस्य के नाते से एक-एक डाकूमेंट को मैंने अपने चक्षुओं से देखा है । आप भी सरकार में आए थे । बताइये मुझे बिचौलिये दूर करने की बात आपने कही थी, जनता सरकार ने कही थी । कहां है आपका वह मानस, कहां है आपका वह स्टेटस, कहां है आपकी वह भावना ?

यह मेरा लीडर था, राजीव गांधी था जिसने इस देश के लोगों को कहा कि ऐसे सौदों में कोई बिचौलिये नहीं रहे।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : आप सच्चाई को बताइये ।

श्री मीर्जा इर्शादबेग : बता रहे है, लेकिन सच्चाई को आखें मूद कर आप देख रहे हैं, आपने आंखें मूंद दी है । आप देखना नहीं चाहते कि आपके सामने सत्य क्या है ।

मान्यवर, सूरज के सामने आखें मूंद लेने से सूरज की रोशनी पर कोई असर नहीं पड़ता ।

समिति बनाने के लिए किसने कहा था ? क्यों नहीं आए हमारे साथ समिति में--देख लेते एक-एक डाकूमेंट और अगर आते तो देखते कि विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह ने एज ए फाइनैंस मिनिस्टर ने भी इस पर दस्तखत किये थे ।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : आपकी टर्म्स पर नहीं आए है ।

श्री मीर्जा इर्शादबेग : हमारी टर्म्स क्या थीं ? वह यह थीं कि सच्चाई देखनी है । ... **(व्यवधान)** क्योंकि यह सब बातें राजनीति से प्रेरित थी । ... **(व्यवधान)**

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : हम चाहते हैं कि सच्चाई को बताया जाए ।... **(व्यवधान)**

श्री मीर्जा इर्शादबेग : जब यह वोट लेने, लोगों का विश्वास लेने के लिए गये हैं, तो आपको देश की जनता ने इतना धक्का दिया है और इसके लिए आप हताश हो गये । आप हताश हो गए है और समस्त विपक्ष आज हताश है और वह देखना चाहता है राजीव गांधी की सरकार को जो एक स्थापित सरकार है उसको कैसे उलट किया जा सके । मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि आप क्यों नहीं आते और देखते कि डाकूमेंट क्या हैं ? सरकार ने जो बात

[श्री मिर्जा इर्शाद बेग]

स्वीडन के साथ की है, सरकार ने जो बात बोफोर्स के साथ में की है ? एक-एक पत्र आपको दी है और एक-एक सच्चाई आपके सामने रखी है । लेकिन आज ही लोक दल, यह आपका लोकदल, परलोक दल और फिर क्या मालूम है वह जनता दल दलदल बना गया है और दलदल के नेता के बारे में बहुत बातें हुई हैं । आइये, सच्चाई साबित कीजिए । हमारे नेताओं ने भी कहा है कि एक एकाऊंट का नम्बर दिया है कि आइये साबित कर दीजिए । भ्रष्टाचार के लिए तो हम नहीं कह रहे हैं यही आपके पड़ोस में अलग-बगल में बैठने वाले उनके जो नेता हैं, मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि उनके खिलाफ कोर्ट ने स्ट्रिक्चर्ज पास नहीं किए ? दाग तो बहुत दामन पर लगे हैं। लेकिन राजीव गांधी के खिलाफ तो किसी कोर्ट ने स्ट्रिक्चर पास नहीं किया । मान्यवर, विपक्ष के तो बहुत प्रयास थे कि इंदिरा गांधी को भी देश से उखाड़ कर फैंक दें, लोगों के मानस से उखाड़ कर फैंक दें। गांव पंच आपने बनाए हैं । गांव पंच ने जमीन उलट दी है ; मान्यवर, बाल-बाल उलटा है, यहां तक कि महरौली के इंदिरा गांधी के घर को भी नहीं छोड़ा। लेकिन निकला क्या ? जब ये सब बातें निकलीं तो देश के मानस ने देखा, जन जन ने देखा कि ये सब बातें निकालने से यह बात साबित हो करके आई देश के लोगों के सामने कि इंदिरा गांधी एक ऐसी सच्चाई है, एक ऐसी हकीकत है कि जिसको कभी भुलाया नहीं जा सकता । लोगों ने देखा और लोगों ने इतिहास को पलटा और आपको यहां पांच साल के लिए लाया गया था और आपको अपने आप ही उसने हटाया तथा इंदिरा गांधी को प्रस्थापित किया । आप बोफोर्स गन की बात कर रहे हैं, उसके डील की बात कर रहे हैं । सब सच्चाई आपके सामने रखी गई और अभी भी सरकार का यह प्रयास है, सरकार अभी भी इन्क्वायरी कर रही है। गलत और झूठी बयानबाजी पर आज आपका विपक्ष इन नेताओं को ले करके चल रहा है । मैं आपसे पूछता हूं, राम अवधेश जी, इतना देश में अकाल था, आपकी प्रायरिटीज क्या हैं ? यह तो मेरी पार्टी थी, राजीव गांधी का नेतृत्व था कि देश में जहां-जहां अकाल पड़ा वहां-वहां कांग्रेस इकाइयों ने जा करके लोगों के बीच में काम किया है । मान्यवर, जनता पार्टी कहां गई, लोक दल कहां गया, भारतीय जनसंघ कहां गया और कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी कितने लोगों के पास पहुंची ? कहां है आपकी नीति ? अरे, कोई जगह नहीं पहुंची । यह झूठ है।

मान्यवर, बचपन में एक कहानी पढ़ा करता था जिसका नाम "अलीबाबा और चालीस चोर" था । न जाने कौन सी जमात यह अलीबाबा कौन हैं और 40 चोर कहां बैठे हैं ? लोग देख रहे हैं और लोगों को मालूम है । आप जाकर देखिए, उत्तर प्रदेश के जो निर्णय आए हैं उसके अनुसार 80 प्रतिशत जनता ने कांग्रेस के शासन में अपना विश्वास प्रस्थापित किया है । आपको मालूम न हो तो देख लीजिए, आज भी नतीजे आ रहे हैं और वह भी 80 प्रतिशत हमारी फेवर में आ रहे हैं । लोग जानते हैं कि यह आपकी मिली-भगत है देश के उन एजेंटों के साथ में और आपने जिसको नेता प्रस्थापित किया है विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह, फेयरफैक्स के० सी० आई०ए० वालों के साथ में बैठ करके देश की जो खुफिया बातें पहुंचाई आपने देश के उन गद्दारों के साथ में वह देश को मालूम है और देश पहचानता है। देश की जनता का वह मानस है उसका एक हृदय है, उसकी एकदृष्टि है और वह पहचानने की क्षमता रखती है। जब समय आयेगा तब पता लग जायेगा कि देश की जनता राजीव गांधी के नेतत्व के साथ है या अंधेरे में भटकने वाले विपक्ष के साथ में है । मैं आपको पूछना चाहता हूं कि आपकी नीतियां कहां हैं ? आप बोलते क्यों नहीं हैं ? देश में बहुत से इश्यू हैं । देश में कम्युनल वातावरण का जहर फैलता जा रहा है आपके बगल में बैठने वाले कुछ लोगों के कारण, उनकी नीतियों के कारण और उनके मानस के कारण, उसे रोकने की आपके पास क्या चेष्टा है ? राम-जन्म-भूमि और बाबरी मस्जिद का इश्यू है । क्या आपकी नीति है और आपके क्या आर्थिक कार्यक्रम हैं ? अरे, यह तो राजीव गांधी का

एक मानस और नेतृत्व देश में काम कर रहा है जो आज कहना चाहता है कि देश में से कम्युनल वातावरण को दूर किया जाए। यही करना चाहता है। अभी नहीं समझोगे और अभी नहीं समझोगे तो इकबाल ने कहा था कि :—

"मिट जाओगे जो अभी भी नहीं समझोगे तो मिट जाओगे, और तुम्हारा नाम भी नहीं होगा दास्तानों में।"

मान्यवर, अब इनको समझ ही नहीं है तो मैं क्या बोलूं। इनके पास न वह दृष्टि है, न वह मानस है, न वह दिमाग रखते हैं और खाली दिमाग से बोफोर्स-बोफोर्स लेकर जाते है ... **(व्यवधान)** ...

Yes, I am reply to you. What ever the speeches made by the Opposition people, I am replying to the same. My Minister will reply to all the things. (Interruptions). Listern, time will come when the people of India will decide the further of the country. What do you say?

मान्यवर, मुझे फिर एक श्लोक याद आ रहा है, "सुभाषित" में कहा गया है—

"काक कृष्णा, पिका कृष्णा, को भेद पिक काकयो अरे वसंत प्रातःकाले काके काकहः पिका पिकः।"

मान्यवर, यह देश की जनता को पता है कि कौवा कौन है और कोयल कौन है। वसंत ऋतु जब आएगी तब पता लगेगा, उसकी आवाज से कि यह कौवा है और यह कोयल है। आपको फिक्र करने की जरूरत नहीं है देश की जनता ने जब-जब चाहा, तब प्रस्थापित किया पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू को, तब प्रस्थापित किया लाल बहादुर शास्त्री को, तब प्रस्थापित किया इंदिरा गांधी को और ऐसा समय भी आया कि जब जनता ने समझा इंदिरा गांधी जी अभी लायक नहीं हैं तो घर पर भी बैठाया और उसी जनता ने भारी बहुमत के साथ देश में इंदिरा गांधी के नेतृत्व को, कांग्रेस से नेतृत्व को फिर से यहां पर प्रस्थापित किया।

बोफोर्स की चर्चा के दौरान मान्यवर उपसभापति जी, मैंने कहा था कि यह मसला राजनीति से प्रेरित होकर के चला रहे हैं और इसको इलेक्शन तक चलाते रहेंगे। ऐसा विपक्ष के लोगों ने अभी कमिटमेंट भी किया है। तो यह राजनीति से प्रेरित बातें हैं। गन या बोफोर्स उनके लिये कुछ नहीं लगती। यह तो राजीव गांधी की सक्षमता है कि कांग्रेस की एक विचारधारा है, जिसकी वजह से हमारे सामने सबसे बड़ी प्रायरिटी देश की सुरक्षा है, देश की सीमाओं की सुरक्षा है, देश के लोगों के नागरिक हकों की स्वतंत्रता और उसकी सुरक्षा है। उस प्रायरिटी को आप नहीं समझोगे। दरबारा सिंह जी ने सही कहा, आप उन शक्तियों के साथ है, यह फेयरफेक्स में सी० बी० आई० इंक्वारी कर रही है, विश्वास नहीं है, सी०आई०ए० में उनका विश्वास है और सी० आई० ए० के लोगों के साथ बैठकर के सब जो हमारी खुफिया फाईल हैं, स्कूप दिया है उन लोगों को, हर्षमेन के साथ बात की है। क्या सी० आई० ए० के इतिहास से आप अनजान हैं? सी० आई० ए० ने समग्र विश्व में क्या किया है, उससे आप अनजान हैं? वही नेता को बैठाने जा रहे हैं। देश की जनता आपको माफ नहीं करेगी और देश की जनता आपको बताकर रख देगी कि देश की जनता का विश्वास कहां है? .... **(व्यवधान)**

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : : प्रधान मंत्री अनजान है। इसके लिये प्रधान मंत्री जवाब दें।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री आनन्द शर्मा) : आप बैठ जाईए राम अवधेश जी। जब आप भाषण करते हैं तो पूरी बात कह दिया करें। आप बैठिए दूसरे लोग हैं विपक्ष के वे बोल देंगे।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : प्रधान मंत्री खुद जवाब दें... **(व्यवधान)** .....

श्री मीर्जा इर्शादबेग : मान्यवर अंत में मैं यही कहना चाहता हूं कि आज देश में को अधिक आवश्यकता है। मान्यवर आपकी तरह मैं भी एक-दो देश में जाकर आया हूं। वहां मैंने देखा है कि मेरे प्रधान मंत्री जी और मेरी पार्टी के नेता ने किस ढंग से देश के एक लेवल को ऊंचा लाकर विश्व स्तर पर इसको इज्जत दिलाई है, किस तरह आबरू दिलाई है। इस आबरू की दहशत में आ कर आज यही लोग पागल बनकर अंधाधुंध जो यह इस तरह की बातें कर रहे हैं उससे उनका कोई भी लक्ष्य हो, उस लक्ष्य को यह पा नहीं सकेंगे। देश की जनता जानती है कि उनके सही काम कौन कर रहा है, देश की महिलाएं जानती हैं देश के युवक जानते हैं, देश का विद्यार्थी जगत जानता है कि उनका श्रेय कहां है, देश का श्रेय कहां है, देश का हित कहां है और देश के असीम हित में आने वाले दिनों में उनका निर्णय करने वाला है। आने वाले दिनों में वे आपको बताएंगे और उस वक्त राम अवधेश जी मुझे याद रहेगा आप माथा पकड़ कर कोने में बैठकर रोएं।

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात खतम करता हूं। धन्यवाद।

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir I straightway would like to strike at the very foundation of the cover-up edifice built up by this Government on Bofors. A mass of evidence contained in three types of transaction documents obtained by The 'Hindu' from highly authoritative sources established that commission payments by Bofors to the three recipient fronts, Sevenska Incorporated, Pitco-Moresco-Moineao and A. E. Services Limited, are firmly linked to the payments made by the Government of India to Bofors in 1986-87 against invoiced deliveries or as advances. Among the various documents published in 'The Hindu', there is a remittance document relating to the code name 'Tulip. The type of payment is coded 62, the banking code for commissions. The instruction at the bottom translates as 'Attention'. The sender should not be mentioned or the payment as per instructions given on telephone. Sir, on 3rd August this year, when we discussed Bofors, I made specific questions to the Government and I quote:

> "Will this Government request the Swedish Prosecutor to make a fresh investigation based upon the published relevant materials in 'The Hindu', have a fresh probe?"

That was my question. Again, I put another question:

> May I ask this Government to investigate Account No. 99921 TU of Svenska Incorporated in the Societe de Banque Suisse located at No. 2 Rue de La Confederation, CH—1211 Geneva? It is a specific demand. I will also refer to payments made to 'Lotus'. These were made into Societe de Banque, Suisse, 2 Rue de La Confederation, and a payment was made also on 22nd December, 1986...'

Sir, I placed these specific questions before the Government in the month of August in this forum. Mr. K. C. Pant was kind enough to reply. I quote his reply.

> "We will do what is normally done. So far as Mr. Gopalsamy's question is concerned, we are relying on our own agencies and we have confidence in them."

Now, Sir, I would like to know from this Government: What information have you elicited through your agencies? This is the question. Now some account number has been given by Mr. V. P. Singh and discussion is going on. When I put the question before the Government in the month of August, Mr. Pant was kind enough to say that he was relying upon our own agencies. Again, our hon. Prime Minister in his interview to the Sunday' magazine said:

> We have not finished trying CBI is looking into it."

Mr. Gandhi went on to tell the interviewers that Mohan Katre, the Director

of CBI, had gone and met Mr. Lars Ringberg as well as persons in Sweden's National Bank. Explaining the reasons why the Government had not acted on 'The Hindu' documents, Mr. Gandhi said, among other things, that 'The Hindu' documents were said by the Swedish bank to have some defects in them. He was asked what those defects were and he said, 'There are some doubts about their authenticity. Sir, Mr. Per Wendel from Stockholm made a write-up yesterday which has appeared in today's Indian Express'. I would like to quote the Chief Lawyer of the Swedish National Bank, Mr. Aake Gustafsson. In the report it is stated:

> "The Chief lawyer of the Swedish National Bank, Mr. Aake Gustafsson, today confirmed to me that two officers from India had visited the bank. But his account of the meeting is the opposite of the one conveyed by Mr. Gandhi. "We told them as we always do, Mr. Gustafsson says, "that" they had made the trip in vain."

[The Vice-Chirman (Shri Jagesh Desai): in the Chair]

Mr. Gustafsson states categorically that "we did not make any comment on the authenticity of these documents". This goes contrary to what was asserted by our honourable Prime Minister about the authenticity of the documents published in THE HINDU. So it is a total denial about the statement of the honourable Prime Minister...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): That is what THE INDIAN EXPRESS says.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Yes; this is a report from Per Wendel from Stockholm about Ringberg because our honourable Prime Minister made a reference to Ringberg. Mr. Ringberg confirms. "These gentlemen had no accreditation with themselves." He is referring to these officers from the CBI. "There was no diplomatic contact before the visit and they had not been in contact with interpol Because of this it was not possible for the Swedish National Police to meet these gentlemen." Therefore, I would like to know from the Government whether there was any diplomatic contact, whether the Government of India took steps with the Interpol. These are the very agitating questions. "Mr. Ringberg also goes on to say that he told the Indian visitors that several months ago he had asked the Indian authorities if any kind of investigation was going on in Indian on these matters. He says that he told the visitors that the questions 'have been repeated a lot of times', but in spite of this having been done, he had not received any answer as yet." I would like to know from the Government whether Mr. Ringberg is correct as per the version of Mr. Per Wendel, whether he made any requests to this Government, if so, what the reaction has been of this Government to those requests. Our honourable Prime Minister said in Bangalore on 10th November before the press when he was asked a specific question "Whether or not the documents revealed the payment of commission", "Mr. Gandhi said, 'We have never denied it', adding 'the CBI is looking into it' ". When the Prime Minister made the statement before the press that we have never denied about the commission money, the Government officials—they were very intelligent and they were very alert—came with a denial; a denial came from the spokesmen of the Government. They gave a new interpretation to the statement of the Prime Minister as if he had not denied about the publication of THE HINDU reports—a new interpretation. How many somersaults will the Government make? First when the Swedish Broadcasting Radio made the revelation, when there was a bolt from the blue from the Swedish Broadcasting Radio, our honourable Prime Minister said, "No question of commission money", "There had been no middlemen". So the payment of commission money was totally denied by him. It was supported by Mr. Arun Singh on the floor of this very House in the month of April last year. Then the very same Mr. Arun Singh came here again and said, "Bofors had committed a breach of faith. So the monies should be refunded". Our honourable Prime Minister comes to Parliament and says,

[Shri V. Gopalsamy]

"There has been no payment of commission money". Now he takes the position, "Neither I nor the members of my family received any money from Bofors". Sir, I agree fully with him. Our honourable Prime Minister is honest, according to his version; I agree. But a million-dollar question is to be answered by this Government. Payment of commission has been proved beyond any shadow of doubt, with irrefutable evidence and with incontrovertible evidence. So, the commission money has been paid, crores of rupees have been paid, to fetch this deal, to get this order, from the Government of India. Then I would like to know for what reasons Bofors paid the commission money to X or Y or Z. Our honourable Prime Minister is honest, according to his version; I agree. But who is that extra-constitutional authority, who is that gentleman, behind the curtain? Who is the man who influenced the Government to finalise the deal? I am asking this because it is our Prime Minister, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, who has finalised the deal since he was handling the portfolio of Defence. So, this is the question which is agitating the mind of everybody. Who is that extra-constitutional authority and who is that big man who could give orders above the head of the Prime Minister? So, there should be a deal. Otherwise Bofors are not fools or idiots to part with such a good amount of money in the name of commission payment. So, the commission money has been paid and that has been proved. But for whom? For what reasons? What is his address? Our honourable Prime Minister is honest, according to his version; I agree. Then it is the duty not only of the Government, but also of every citizen of this country to find out the truth. You have to find out who that scoundrel is, who that culprit is, who that offender is, who has looted this money. Who has looted this money? Who is behind the curtain to influence the Government to strike the deal? This is the question.

Sir, how many somersaults this Government does! I am trying to say that "Mr. Clean"—once he was applauded as a clean person, as "Mr. Clean"—has become a man of many somersaults. How many somersaults he does! He says, "No commission money.". Then he says, "Neither I nor the members of my family have received any money.". When the question of Hindujas came up, he said... (*Time bell rings*). Only one minute, Sir. When the question of Hindujas came up, he said, "I did not meet anybody from Bofors.". But it was above beyond any shadow of doubt that Hindujas met Mr. Martin Arbbo and others, the Bofors people.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: What does it mean?

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: It is the duty of the Govenrment to come and tell the Parliament. The Goverınment is accountable to the country, the Government is accountable to the people. So, they should come and tell Parliament as to who the recipients are, who the recipients of this money are. Therefore, Sir, I say that you are not pursuing your investigation. It is only a cover-up. When you say that the CBI is looking into it, it is only a cover-up. That is why you are not sincere in probing it, in finding out the truth. That is why questions arise. Who are the recipients of this money? The credibility of the Government has been totally demolished. The casualty in the whole episode is truth and nothing but truth. The casulty is truth. Because of the versions of the honourable Prime Minister, if somebody wants to find out the meaning of "falsehood" or untruth" in the Chambers Dictionary or Oxford Dictionary or in any other dictionary, we can give a new interpretation because the Government is giving a new interpretation and so, one can give a new interpretation to the utterances of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi during the years 1987 and 1988 in his capacity as Prime Minister: His utterances are nothing but falsehoods and untruths and the utterances of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi are equivalent to falsehood and untruth. That is why his credibility has been lost and the people are telling... (*Interruptions*) ...The Government is put in the dock ... (*Time bell rings*)... Only one

minute, Sir. The Government is in the dock. Sir, the Government is put in the dock and this Government, headed by Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, will face the trial. Not only that. He will face the punishment also. The real culprits who have been protected by this Government will face the trial and punishment because their days are being numbered; days of sitting in power have been numbered. The day is not far off to put these people who have looted the people's money in the dock, and they will face the consequences.

8.00 P.M.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Mr. J. S. Aurora. Ten minutes.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: I won't take ten minutes. I am not going to take too long a time because enough has been said already. All I have to say is that any doubt that might have remained in anyone's mind that middlemen existed and commissions were paid by A. B. Bofors to certain people and parties relating to the medium machine-gun contract with the Government of India have now been completely removed. Ample documentary evidence has been disclosed by the media and others to convince even the Doubting Thomases. And eventually the Prime Minister had to accept that commissions have been paid. But he tried to create a red herring to explain away the documented revelation, which he cannot deny. To consider that this money might have been paid for some work that had been done by certain parties for A. B. Bofors to the tune of Rs. 64 crores, I think, is beyond the coprehension of anybody that that much money would have been paid just for the purpose of finding information about the competitive corporations. I do admire, however, the Prime Minister's fighting a rearguard battle so valiantly. In fact it almost looks like a strip-tease dance, and it seems that very little is left to clothe the excuses that have been produced so far. I also know that he has been very faithfully and diligently served by his Ministers and the Joint Parliamentary Committee members, but not with any degree of success. Why? Because they have failed to carry conviction in the public mind. Truth must eventually prevail. Now that the truth is out, a great effort is being made to malign the erstwhile finance Minister and Defence Minister who was forced to quit because he was a misfit amongst the people who put party before country and self-interest before morality and duty. From the outset, the Government reacted to any mention of wrong doing in this deal most violently. Charges were levelled against the Opposition for trying to destabilise the country. Spurious letters appeared in papers from the CIA to convince people. The Prime Minister jumped into the arena stating that he had personally made certain that there would be no middlemen and hence no commission. Later, when payments could not be hidden these were turned into winding-up charges, still insisting that as there was no middleman and no commission. When Shri Arun Singh as the Defence Minister of State wanted to put the Bofors officials on the mat, summon them to explain why and how certain parties had been paid moneys, his decision was countermanded. But later when a strategy was worked out, the same officials were called to give evidence, first in front of the Government and then later before the Joint Parliamentary Committee. And this was accepted as a gospel truth. Later during the discussion when Shri Arun Singh wanted action taken against Bofors, three Ministers got up to defend Bofors. Why? Because the Government was reluctant to look further into the payment Promises were made that the CBI would carry out investigation but nothing has come out of it. Now when the cat is out of the bag the Prime Minister has shifted his ground again. The CBI which is supposed to be looking into the payment, the CBI officials have gone to meet the officials in Sweden on a private visit without being sposored by the Government diplomatically. The fact is that the Government from the beginning tried to stonewall the payment because it has something to hide. Being in power it can block information. This may prevent complete exposure. But it does not increase the Government's credibility with the public. The Leader of the House, while intervening, asked some questions. I would like to

[Sardar Jagjit Singh Aurora]

react to them. He asked, "What is the debate for?" My answer is, "Accountability of the Executive to the Legislature which has been denied to us, and honest information to the public and it has also been denied." And that is why the debate is necessary. The second point is: We are creating an issue. We are not creating an issue. It is an issue which will not go away until such time the Government is able to give convincing and honest answers. Now, it has been said that V. P. Singh signed the contract when he was the Minister of Finance. Of course, he did. But he signed the contract on terms and conditions which had been accepted first by the Defence Ministry and, I am sure, later on by the Cabinet. But he did not sign the contract about approving the payment of commissions. Now, we are even today being asked to accept that there have been no middlemen. I am afraid it is impossible to accept when commissions have been paid and commissions can only be paid if there were middlemen. So it is no use repeating this statement *ad inifinitum* because it is not believable. Issues were also raised about the quality of the gun. We have always accepted that it is a good gun; not necessarily the best gun. but it is a good gun, a very good gun. But as I said earlier on during the day, it is comparable with Sofma gun produced by the French. Therefore, now to say. "Having bought a good gun, could anybody have influenced the actual contract? What is wrong when it is in competition and knowing people are apt to accept kickbacks, that Bofors gave larger kickbacks than the French poeple did and therefore they landed the contract?"

I would like to mention that in this case the Prime Minister's own reputation is involved. To clear himself it is vital that the Government comes out with the truth, nothing but the truth, and it is no longer relevant to say that what information had been given to us is not sufficient as an evidence and the Government cannot take any further action. If I may be permitted a slight digression, we all know who the guilty were of November '84 killings and carnage. By not taking action against those people, the public has started suspecting that....**

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): No, no, this kind of remark should not be on record. The Prime Minister himself had gone there that night and you are talking like that (*Interruptions*)

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: I am finishing.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): This kind of remark should not be recorded. This will not go record.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: Why not? Are you going to say that the guilty have been punished?

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: The Prime Minister himself took the strongest measures to quel the riot.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: But has the guilty been punished?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Punishing is a different thing and our uttering that is quite a different thing. That does not form part of the proceedings.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: What is unparliamentary about it?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): It is irrelevant. It will not be on record.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: That is the trouble. This Government is incapable of facing the truth.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: I am not in agreement with him on this issue. It may be unfortunate, but there is nothing unparliamentary about it. Why should it be off the record? That is not proper, Sir. (*Interruptions*)

**Not recorded.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: Tell me, Sir, is there any justification by this Government that thousands of people are killed and nobody is punished? And you don't want that to go on record.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): It has no relevance.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: If you do not take action, if you cannot do justice, your Government has lost all moral right to govern.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): It has no relevance. It will not form part of the record.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: And because there is a minute minority, you want to get away with it. You will not. I can assure you that this Government will fall because it is being built on false foundations. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: This Government is here not at your mercy. (*Interruptions*).

DR. NAGEN SAIKIA (Assam): He has said nothing unparliamentary. He has**

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): I have not said that the last part is wrong. I have not allowed only that is not relevant.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: What is wrong? Please tell me. What is unparliamentary there?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): I have not said unparliamentary. I said that it is irrelevant (*Interruptions*) Now the matter ends there.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: If I may be permitted to say, this Government is incapable to do justice, to come out honestly.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): That you can say. I have no objection.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: Will you allow that?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): That you can say.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: All right, you put that in. It is unable to do justice and, therefore, it has lost all moral right to govern.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Now, Shri Hanumanthappa.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA (Karnataka): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, having heard all the discussion on this, I am surprised that the hon. Member, Mr. Gurupadaswamy, who raised the discussion is not present here. They said, the reported disclosures. I do not know when he came to know of these disclosures. According to Mr. Gopalsamy, he himself has put all the details on the floor of the House in the month of August itself. And now in the month of November again they say about 'the reported disclosures' and that they want a discussion. Sir, the point here is that the Opposition is not interested in the truth or in a discussion or in the reply or in the accountability. If that was *their attitude, they would have sat through* to listen to the replies because every Member from this side is giving some sort of reply to their points

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Political replies.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Yes, you are also playing politics. What for you are a political party? You are also playing politics. I am also playing politics. Let us accept it. Why are you shouting every time about Shri Lanka? It is because of politics. (*Interruptions*) When Mr. Gopalsamy interrupts, I have to answer. I have to pay him in the same coin.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: But all your speakers did not meet the point of Bofors, the specific questions on Bofors.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: During the last 20 months, this House has discussed this issue more than a dozen times. I have patiently listened to the

**Not recorded.

[Shri H. Hanumanthappa]

speeches of the opposition Members, including Mr. Gopalsamy. Most of their speeches are only repetition. Let him go through the records and see if he has brought anything new.. (*Interruptions*))

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Today I have sought very many new clarifications. Are you prepared to meet those points and give clarification?

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Except quoting "Sunday" interview and quoting some revelations in The Indian Express, nothing new has come. I was myself a journalist, and my journalist friends will bear me out. . .

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Some of them are there.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: We say if a dog bites a man, it is not news; if a man bites a dog, that is news. That is how we as journalists want to create some sensation; otherwise the usual routine thing is no reporting; so some sensation should come out. . .

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: That is how Mr. Gopalsamy makes news today.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Nobody has challenged Mr. Rajiv Gandhi. . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): But he is giving you credit.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: I am only supporting you. These are not new disclosures. The opposition is not interested either in the revelations or the disclosures or the truth. If they were really interested, they would have joined the JPC. The terms were amended according to their wishes, according to their dictation. In spite of that, they did not join, because they never wanted to close this issue. That is the reason behind it. Because of Allahabad election, they thought, yes, they had a reason to keep the issue alive. They were talking of Hindi belt, and now results of U.P. elections have come and that is one reason they want to keep the issue alive That is their political game; that is the motivation. Tomorrow, what ever Panigrahiji or Pantji may say, they are not prepared to accept it, because they do not wnat to close the file; they somehow or other want to keep it alive till the next election. And they are wanting elections to be preponed. That is what they are visualising. They are visualising that elections will come early, and because of Congress Party organising a rally, conducting AICC, talking of electoral reforms they feel that there may be elections soon and so they want to keep something alive, because they have no other point to speak outside in the public. They have no point to make when they go before the people. And now they say our credibility has gone. We do not want to establish our credibility, or the credibility of this Government for your sake; we are not here by your mercy; we are not here by your support. Our supporters are our masters, the voters. We are here on this side of the House because of our masters, and we are answerable to them only. We need not establish our party's credibility or our Government's credibility before Mr. Gopalsamy or Mr. Chitta Basu or Mr. Nagen Saikia or our Telugu Desam friend Mr. Upendra. We have to establish our credibility before the people of the country who are looking to us and looking to you as well. You feel that people will vote for you; you are asking for removal of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi and you are dreaming to come to this side of the House. But I have great respect for my voters; they may not be literate; but they are intelligent. When they did not want the Congress Party, they asked us to sit on that side. But you did not prove yourself worthy; you did not behave yourself and in spite of five-year life given to you, you went out and the people brought us into majority and put us on this side of the House. So, the people of the country are wise enough and whatever may be said or done, they are interested in the stability and integrity of the country. They are watching us and they are watching you also. What are your programmes, they know. After all, the people of this country know which party can hold the country together and safeguard its integrity and unity and take the country forward. They are looking at you and they know

that you are only drawing blank. Whatever you may say, in fact you have no programme to place before the people. You cannot fool the people. You may fool all the people for some time and some people for all the time but you cannot always fool all the people all the time. . .

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: That very much applies to your Government.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: It applies to you because you are trying to fool the people. I have already said that we are not answerable to you; we need not establish our credibility before you.

Coming to accountability, what Mr. Aurora said, what is this JPC report and what are the terms that you gave as legislators, and what has the Committee come out with? My point is, any amount of JPCs will not satisfy you. Let us go to the people, but not at your instance. It is the prerogative of this Government and of this party to go before the people because we are not at your mercy and we cannot do anything on your demand. It is for us to decide the things. Unfortunately you are not in the position to decide about it. Any amount of shouting, saying 'Resign' or 'hatao' is not going to help and nothing is going to happen. No amount of shouting will bring you to this side. You will have to wait till the time comes and only then the people will decide whom to vote for as they are watching your performance, your policies and programmes, your unity or Dals or the Fronts; they are watching all this. My point is, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that they are not prepared to accept the truth; they are not prepared to accept that a crow is black; they would say it is white. Even during the broad day light if we say it is the sun they will say no, to accept whatever is said by this party. Why should we go on beating about the bush? You can go through all the earlier debates on Bofors. Our Prime Minister promised on the floor of the House to appoint a Committee and invited you to join. What was wrong? If you had the evidence, why did you not appear before the JPC and present your evidence. People from opposition visited Switzerland 17 times. What is the evidence they could get? Why have they not presented that evidence before the JPC? I am not in the habit of hitting below the belt. I do not go into all that; everything is published in the press as to where they have gone and how they spent their days and nights; I do not go into all that.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: You must be happy that Chitra Subramaniam comes from Bangalore and she has been able to find out all these documents.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: You should appreciate, the Leader of the House has paid tributes to her.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: She has produced evidence.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Unfortunately, none of you could produce it.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I agree, we could not; but she has produced this evidence.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: It is not evidence; it is something else; unfortunately you do not know the difference.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: People are watching that so much of time of the House has been spent and the entire united opposition has not been able to produce a single evidence. What more you want? Let us go to the people. You come out with your evidence. People will say where you should be and where our party should be.

I am concluding, Mr. Vice-Chairman. Unfortunately, we have spent a lot of time on this. But the point is that the Opposition is not going to accept whatever version we give. Therefore, we should go on with our work. The caravan should go on. After all, ultimately, we are answerable to our masters. Let us go to our masters who are

[Shri H. Hanumanthappa]

watching our performance, the performance of the Government. They are watching our programmes, our policies, our ideologies and our leadership. 'Rajiv Hatao'. This is your slogan today. Is Mr. Gopalsamy going to become the Prime Minister? Have you come to an unanimous decision? Have you reached a consensus in favour of one person? Not yet. Are you going to make Mr. Vajpayee or Mr. Advani or Mr. Gurupadaswamy? No. You are thinking of Mr. V. P. Singh as an alternative. What is the position? He is a person who has been in the Government. If he knew that money was going out illegally, was he not capable of stopping it? He could have resigned on that day itself. I would have admired him as a hero. He has seen the file. He has approved the file. He has approved all the agreements and contracts. Now, because you are out, you have come out with this plea. People will never forget these things.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Mr. Gopalsamy is laughing.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: I know. He has no defence for these things. How can a person who could not stop this when he had power in his hands, when he had power in his pen, rule this country? Can he give an alternative Government? Do you think that you can fool the people of this country? If you are dreaming, I can only say that you are living in a fool's paradise.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: He will be better than Rajiv Gandhi

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Let us see. Mr. Gopalsamy, I take you back to 1985. When he came to power, everyone of your leaders admired Rajiv Gandhi's administration. Rajiv Gandhi never said publicly 'I am Mr. Clean'. Who said Mr. Rajiv Gandhi was 'Mr. Clean'? It was the Press and the Opposition. They said that he was starting on a clean slate and that he was Mr. Clean. Was it wrong that he wanted to be clean? Was it wrong that he wanted to be honest? When he started on such a good note, you thought it was a danger singal for you and you realised that it was going to hamper you and it was going to hit you back. Therefore, you started this scandalous and malicious propaganda. I know you are not going to stop this whatever may be the explanation from the Government side. You want to keep the fire burning till the elections. I am sure people will give a fitting answer to this scandalous and malicious propaganda which the Opposition is indulging in. We have faith in the people. We are prepared to go to the people with our programmes, with our achievements, with our policies and with our leadership. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Mr. Matto. Only five minutes.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO: Sir, you always give me only five minutes. Anyway, I will conclude within the stipulated time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Within three minutes? Thank you.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO: Sir, I was trying to recollect the two Persian couplets which I recited in the course of the TV discussion on the Bofors deal, before the Joint Parliamentary Committee was constituted, in which Mr. Gurupadaswamy, Mr. K. C. Pant, Mr. Masodkar and myself were the participants. I said:

به طواف کعبه رفتم به حرم رهم نه دادند
تو بیرون خانه چه کوئی- که درون خانه آئی

I translate it. 'I went to perambulate the Ka'ba but they did not allow me in. They said 'what did you do outside that you want to come in?' because being inside rather than outside is to be in

a privileged position.' I also recited another verse as this.

تو محرم نیستی محروم ازانی
رہ زنا محرمان اندر حرم نیست

"You are not known or you do not know, so you are deprived of the secrets. there is no place inside for those who are not known." These are the couplets recited by me to the opposition. The opposition Member, Shri Ram Jethmalani has said, it has gone on record, that the opposition must wring their hands in despair for not having participated in the Joint Parliamentary Committee on that day. Now they are talking of joining the Parliamentary Committee but it is no use, they cannot weep over the split milk, those days are gone.

I have to make another point that the people tend to forget the circumstances or the things that come to light. I have followed with some attention the things that came in the *Hindu, the Indian Express* and other papers that these people are quoting. When I was in Srinagar, a photostat copy was given in the *Indian Express* about payments having been made to Svenska. I wanted to show that this was not the new name. In my notes I found that Svenska is incorporated in Panama and an agreement with Bofors was made by them in 1978 when Congress was not in power. Their directors are the three ladies, whose names are: (1) CF De Perry, (2) V. C. de Podrique and (3) M. R. Sarmiento. This company is registered in Panama but mainly functions in Switzerland. Address in Switzerland is: RUE du la Confederation, Geneva, Switzerland. General consultancy agreement with AB Bofors relating to sales of their products, territory includes India, agency terminated in 1986 and payments made to them as winding charges. (*Interruptions*). It is all given in the papers which you are quoting. The point at issue is this. Sir, you are a Chartered Accountant. You know it that this agreement was made in 1978 when Shri Rajiv Gandhi was not in power.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: He was not in politics at all at that time.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO: Sir, whatever be the nature of this agreement, we are not going into them, according to this agreement some payments had to be made and Shri V. P. Singh came out with three receipts of payments made to them in lieu of the payments made under that agreement of 1978 although one of those agreements is irrelevant because it does not relate to 155 mm guns. So, the point at issue is that this name 'Svenska' which has been made out of proportion by all the media does not contain anything excepting these three ladies. (*Interruptions*). Yes, now Shri V. P. Singh has offered to resign and go to Sanyas if he does not prove it. I am a small man, I do not belong to the ruling party. I am a small man belonging to a small party. I challenge Shri V. P. Singh that I as a small man, will resign my seat from Parliament if he proves till today—I emphasise 'till today" because what happens tommorrow or day after I do not know—that Rajiv Gandhi had anything to do with Svenska I will resign my seat from Parliament. Merely saying that Svenska payments have been made as a corollary to the agreement that was entered in 1978... (*Interruptions*). He has produced two-three receipts.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): The agreement is of 1978.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO: Those two-three receipts have been produced. One of them does not relate... to 155 m/m guns.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I want to congratulate him, Sir.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO: I was coming from the Notice Office today about two hours back and on the ticker I saw the news. What was the news? That was not a news given by the Congress Party or Government of India. That was a news given by the news agency. The news was the Mr. V. P. Singh had been in a tight corner today in the Lok Sabha because when he was asked to substantiate the charge that Shri Rajiv Gandhi belonged to Svenska, he could not do so. Now he has brought this trouble to himself. Why did

[Shri Ghulam Rasool Matto]

he associate Shri Gandhi with it I challenge him, even now if he produces—till today—that Shri Rajiv Gandhi's name has figured anywhere in his documents, secret or otherwise, I am going to resign. I will not do the way he has done it. He wanted to go into Sanyas. If not today, it is to be seen if tommorrow he will go into Sanyas or not. But I would request the hon. Minister for Defence that the Prime Minister is on record after the *Hindu* documents were made public, that the matter has been entrusted to CBI for enquiry. I would like to know, when he replies, what is the progress of that CBI enquiry and when can we expect some positive thing so that we once and for all close the month of those who say that omething is wrong?

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Next time they will not show any gratitude to you.

DR. NAGEN SAIKIA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I have listened to the speakers from both sides and some time this suspicion came into my mind whether this Short Duration Discussion is being held on Mr. V. P. Singh or on Bofors. All the Opposition speakers have stuck to the Bofors point, but most of the Members of the ruling party have tried to shift their attack to Mr. V. P. Singh.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Dr. Saikia, will you yield for a minute? I will tell you why. It is the disclosure that is important. Who has disclosed it? The initiator has referred to the statements made on the 4th, 5th and 7th. That is why Mr. V. P. Singh has been the target.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: He is a nightmare for them.

DR. NAGEN SAIKIA: The question is, it is not the integrity of Mr. V. P. Singh that is to be discussed; it is the Bofors deal that we are to discuss.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: That we are discussing. But we should be like Caesar's wife in public life before pointing fingers at others.

DR. NAGEN SAIKIA: I am coming to that point. When the Joint Parliamentary Committee was formed in accordance with the designs of the ruling party the Opposition was opposed to it and we did not participate on it because we apprehended the futility of it. And time has proved the futility of the JPC. However, we have seen that the Prime Minister has been shifting his stand from time to time. His statements have been proved to be misleading the House and thenation also. He said, as most of the speakers have already stated, that there was no middleman and it has been proved that there were middlemen and there is a middleman. Then he said, no pay offs were made. Now it is proved that pay-offs were made. And now he seems to stand for Bofors. I want to know what do these code names 'Tulip', 'Lotus', 'Monk Blance' signify? We have come to know from the documents published by the *Hindu* and the documents already disclosed by Mr. V. P. Singh that money was paid into these accounts in the name of 'Tulip' in the name of 'Lotus' and in the name of 'Mont Blanc' and commissions have been paid upto March, 1987. So, it is the belief of the people of the whole country, that to still the voice of the people and to still the voice of the press, specially in this regard, the Government tried to get the Defamation Bill passed. Of course, it failed. The people and the press stood unitedly against this move of the Government. Now the time has come, again, when the Bofors gun itself is pointing to the Government.

The honourable Member, Mr. Salve, is not even ready to believe the documented proof. I would call upon the honourable Member to take the challenge to disprove these documents in the highest court of law. The ruling party, the Congress, is enjoying an overwhelming majority and, therefore, it always exercises it to feed to its own designs.

One of the lady Members, Mrs. Jayanthi Natarajan, had attacked, on hypothetical grounds, certain Members with a view to giving safeguards to her leader. So did another Member, Shri P. N. Sukul I repeat, the integrity of Mr. V.P. Singh

is not the subject-matter of discussion; it is the documents related to Bofors only.

Mr. Jaswant Singh, while speaking about the documents, used a particular word, "authentication." But most of the Members of the ruling party went by the narrow, legal meaning of that word. The Members of the ruling party should know that today nobody believes the Government on this issue. I want to warn that today the capital "C" of the Congress stands for "Corruption", and that is the belief of the people now.

Under these circumstances, why can't the contract with Bofors, because of their violation of it, be cancelled? I urge upon the Government through you, Sir, either to cancel the Bofors contract or, I urge upon the Prime Minister to step down. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Shri Chitta Basu. Five to seven minutes, please. Mr. Basu, I need not tell you this because I know that you are not going to speak for more than five or six minutes.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): Sir, you might have listened to the speeches which have been made by many Members in this House. I would only like to draw your attention to the fact that most of the speakers who participated in this debate from the Treasury Benches have sought to convey the impression that this debate is meaningless, useless and, merely wastage of time. Sir, with all humility I would like to submit that it is not so, because at least a few core questions require to be answered by the Government.

Sir, three core questions have been posed or have been thrown up during the course of the debate: Firstly, whether the Government have misled this Parliament and the nation as a whole on the issue of the Bofors gun deal. Secondly, whether there is the necessity of having a fresh look into the matter, after the JPC's report. Thirdly, whether or not there have been some grievous lapses on the part of the Government in the matter of proceeding with the investigation into the matter in Switzerland. These are the three core questions which have been thrown up by today's debate. Sir, allow me to say that so far as the first question, that is, whether the House has been misled, is concerned, it has been proved that the Government has taken shifting positions from time to time. It has taken not only shifting positions but some conflicting positions which cannot be reconciled. I cite only one or two instances. Earlier, right from the beginning Government, including the Prime Minister, has been saying that there were no middlemen and that there was no payment made. Then a shift took place. There were midlemen earlier but that at our instance their services were terminated and that whatever payment was made in the form or in the shape of winding up charges. Is it not a shift? Thirdly, that there were payments but that no Indian received the payment. Sir, I leave it to you. Is it not a shift of position?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Mr. Basu, when Bofors gave the information to the Government that they were winding up charges, at that point of time if the Government said that they were winding up charges, and now if something else is there, is it a shift?

SHRI CHITTA BASU: This is my point. You have rightly caught mp point. The issue, one of the core questions today is whether there has been any shift of position of the Government and whether this has led to the misleading of the House. That is the question, and I am really happy that you have caught my point and said, "Yes, there has been some shift."

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): No, no, no, Mr. Basu. I said contrary to that, that it is not a shift. At that point of time the Government had that information. If some other information comes to the Government, is it a shift?

SHRI CHITTA BASU: All right. Even accepting your interpretation, I may put another question to you if you permit me: Does it prove the ability of the Government? Does it prove the efficiency of the Government? It has miserably failed to keep the nation informed about the real state of affairs with regard to Bofors.

[Shri Chitta Basu]

Now, lastly, the Prime Minister comes in. The latest thing is, he says, if commission was paid for the Bofors gun deal for some genuine work, then, we cannot question it, we should not think otherwise.

Anyway, my first point is this. There have been shifts. There have been conflicting shifts. There have been conflicting positions taken by the Government which ultimately proves the inefficiency of the Government and irresponsibility of the Government which has eroded very much the credibility of the Government.

Now, about whether there has been a new revelation, I do not say that this is a revelation, I do say it is a disclosure, but certainly you have to agree that a certain new situation has developed after the last debate on the "THE HINDU" disclosure. So far as "THE HINDU" disclosure is concerned, the Government wanted to assure us that the CBI was going into or investigating into the authenticity of the documents. It wanted to put a lid on the controversy on that ground. Now, whether it is from Mr. V. P. Singh or it is from "THE HINDU" disclosure, the hard facts, the irrefutable facts, the incontrovertible facts are two: I would mention only two. These two facts are that the commissions were paid and that they were paid in lieu of materials supplied. And this has been said by Mr. V. P. Singh. It is immaterial for me whether it is a revelation made by Mr. V. P. Singh or by anybody else or whether it is the same revelation as that of the HINDU publication. But the fact remains, particularly after the comment of the Prime Minister that commissions have been paid. If those commissions have been paid for genuine work we have got nothing to grudge. But ultimately this point is leading to the position that commission has been paid and paid in lieu of certain so-called genuine work rendered by some agent. This is a great change. This is the new element in the whole situation. This is a hard fact. The Government has to repudiate it Has anybody repudiated it? Even the Leader of the House has to repudiate it. Up till now he has not repudiated it. Nor has the Government repudiated it. Let us wait and see what the Defence Minister or anybody else says in the reply. But this is one hard fact and it needs to be answered.

Secondly, payments were not in the shape of winding up charges because the payments were made after the gun-deal was signed. Those payments were made in December 1986 and March 1987 while the agreement was signed on March 24, 1986. In this connection I want to draw the attention of the House to the essence of the JPC Report. The essence of the JPC report is and I quote:

> "There is no evidence to show that any middleman was involved in the process of acquisition of the Bofors guns. There is also no evidence to substantiate the allegation of commission, bribes having been paid to anyone."

Now, in the light of these two facts, as I said irrefutable and incontrovertible facts, do you mean to say *that the JPC's Report still continues* to be sacrosanct? My feeling is that with these hard irrefutable facts this JPC Report had been invalidated because of its findings that there was *no commission paid* and no middlemen are involved. Now who is to answer? If these two positions are correct, the findings of the JPC have been invalidated. If JPC Report is *invalidated in the context of* these incontrovertible facts, there is a need for a fresh look into the whole thing.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Please conclude now.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: The third point which I raised is whether there have been lapses on the part of the Government to proceed sincerely with the investigation in the foreign countries with regard to ascertaining or unveilling the truth regarding the stashed-away money. But this is what we have been reported. If they want

to give us any information, it is welcome, but I would place two facts which are in my possession. I have got many points, but I want to quote only two points.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): You have taken eleven minutes. You can take only one minute now.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: I would place only two facts. It is alleged that Mr. Lars Ringberg, the Swedish Public Prosecutor, terminated his inquiry not because of any non-cooperation from the Swiss banks, but because of the advice of somebody else. Somebody says it was the advice of the Foreign Minister of the Swedish Government. Now, a suspicion arises. How is it? Why? For what reason the Minister of Foreign Affairs who is related to the Minister of External Affairs of the Swiss Government has found it feasible to advise or to request Lars Rinberg not to proceed with the enquiry? If it is so, if it is correct, the House has got the right to know the truth about it.

The second point which I want to make is that it is reported that the Government at a certain point of time agreed to sign a Memorandum of Understanding with the Swiss Government because the Swiss Government needed that kind of Memorandum of Understanding to have access to the facts with the Swiss Banks. Now, it is reported that the Government has back tracked and did not fulfil its commitment given to the House that they are sincere in pursuing the matter.

The last point is that our Prime Minister has lamented recently that he has received the political beatings. Sir, I would only like to say.....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): What?

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Political beatings.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: He did not lament.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: It is my interpretation. What was the necessity of making that statement at the crucial time? He may be proud of it but I say he lamented and he has to wait for many more laments.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: He did not lament. He said it boldly that he is prepared to take beating personally for the sake of the country.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Let him become bolder, then, it becomes good for the country.

Now, I say he has lamented. You say he has not lamented. Sir, he is entitled to his view and I am entitled to my view. As I am entitled to my view, I say, he has lamented. But I say that he will have to wait for more beatings at the hustings because he is under a cloud, that is, the general people have already come to this conclusion that the credibility of the Prime Minister has touched very lowest. It is not a matter of pride. He may feel it as a matter of pride. But as an Indian, as a Member of Parliament, we feel ashamed about it because in a democratic institution, in a democratic set-up, the Prime Minister represents the whole nation.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): You have taken 15 minutes.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: I am concluding.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: He started lamenting. He will take some more time.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: I could not follow . . . (Interruptions) . . . You need more time to lament All right, you are allowed more time to lament

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI. After the Opposition have deserted him, he is lamenting.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Lastly, I will say, I am shocked to find out that the Prime Minister of the country functions as a Public Relations Officer of the AB Bofors Company. It is a matter of great shame and it is a matter of shame for the nation as a whole

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: I will begin from where the hon. Member, Shri Chitta Basu ended. I will begin with a proposition to the Government that in consideration of the peculiar situation of the Prime Minister with regard to AB Bofors, with regard to treaty or agreement with AB Bofors and subsequent clarification that he continues to be on behalf of AB Bofors, it is neat and proper that this debate which concerns foremost our Prime Minister be replied to by the Prime Minister himself clarifying all the doubts which have been raised in connection with the deal.

9.00 p.m.

Firstly, for a long time, on the Short Duration discussion, listening to the speeches particularly from the Treasury Benches, I was reminded of some old scenes in this particular House. Perhaps, yesterday or day before yesterday was the birthday of late lamented Piloo Mody. He was in the habit of sometimes pointing out at the Congress Benches and jokingly saying, "they are all bonded labour". I heard him repeat this statement even before Shrimati Indira Gandhi. I do not like this term to be used in respect of a political party. But while listening to all the speeches, I was just wondering what made the Members from that side display so much energy in defending an ever-shifting position of the Government on this particular issue. I don't go into the details. But perhaps, the issues are very simple. It was stated by the Government, by no less a person than the Prime Minister, that through a direct negotiation with the Swedish Prime Minister, Mr. Olof Palme, it was agreed or rather it was enjoined on A.B. Bofors that no commission should be paid. Later on, the Prime Minister is on record, having said that even if one is found guilty on this count, he would be penalised. Now the payment of commission has been proved incontrovertibly but the question of punishment has gone in the background and now our Prime Minister has floated a hypothetical argument. It might have been paid for industrial espionage as if industrial espionage was not an espionage and it was a very holy act. During all these discussions, the most noteworthy thing has been that when the question of cancelling the Bofors agreement came for violation of conditions, many arguments were put forth, why it could not be done the foremost of them being that it will cause a delay in acquiring this type of gun. The delay may be of a very long duration in negotiating everything anew and at the same time, we would lose a huge amount in terms of the payment made. When this was done, were not precautions taken to prevent the merchants of destruction as the Bofors is—armaments industry as such is nothing short of that—they stoop at nothing at selling their merchandise. Even they are not prevented from starting a war in order to sell their merchandise. When entering into an agreement with such a company, who has a very ill-reputation even in Sweden for violation of Swedish rules, why due care was not taken that the conditions are enforced If that is not being done, whose responsibility is it? Is it of Opposition or is it of the Government? I will just tell you one thing Malpractices cannot be made to stand by virtue of majority. Majority, however brute it may be, either in this House or in that House—the confidence of this House does not

matter; the confidence of that House matters—alone will not help. With his stupendous majority, it is impossible for any one, particularly the highest executive of the country, to go scot free either for malpractices or for irresponsibility. This must be kept in mind by the Treasury Benches with all their prevarications led by the Leader of the House when he said that "commission, if paid, in order to influence...." That is the crucial thing in this particular case. The Leader of the House is an ex-Justice, a very eminent lawyer. Does he not see that this is bringing in a new question, once the question has been settled? It does not speak of the strength of the case of the Government. Nobody is interested, at least not myself, in undermining the defence of the country. Many questions have been raised in connection with the entire affair. I have, therefore, suggested that if the Prime Minister is sure of his bona fides, let him come before the House with an open heart, make a clean breast of everything, try to convince the entire house that he is sincere. If it is otherwise, then the responsibility for playing with the country's defence, for utilising the country's defence in partisan interest, in personal interest, will be theirs. In one form or the other, retribution will catch the party which is ruling over the destiny of the country in a very cavalier manner, in a very less-than-honest manner and in a very self-satisfying manner, if they are unable to clear all these doubts. Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, before you adjourn the House, I would like to compliment Mr. V. Gopalsamy besides the last speaker, Mr. Bhattacharjee, for being present here from the Opposition side because there is none other to defend Shri V. P. Singh's allegations or to show the seriousness about the subject.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): But I must also make it very clear that Mr. Dipen Ghosh and Mr. Chaturanan Mishra took my permission. They left only after taking my permission. (Interruptions). About two, I can talk. Now, the discussion is concluded and the Minister will reply tomorrow. The House now stands adjourned and will meet again on 16th November, 1988 at 11 a.m.

The House then adjourned at ten minutes past nine of the clock, till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 16th November, 1988.